

National Collegiate Athletic Association

# **1982 Convention**

## **Proceedings**



**76th Annual Convention**  
**January 11-13, 1982**  
**Houston, Texas**

**Proceedings**

**of the**

**76th Annual  
Convention**

**of the**

**National Collegiate  
Athletic Association**

Hyatt Regency Hotel  
Houston, Texas  
January 11-13, 1982

# Table of Contents

## I. Registrar 1982

Administrative Organization .....	7
Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working Media .....	15

## II. Proceedings of the 76th NCAA Convention

Division I Round Table.....	34
Division II Round Table.....	37
Division III Round Table.....	40
Honors Luncheon .....	47
Opening General Session	
1. Opening Remarks .....	66
2. Report of the Council.....	68
3. Report of the Committee on Memorial Resolutions.....	71
General Round Table .....	73
Business Session	
4. Acceptance of Reports .....	78
5. General Remarks.....	78
6. Proposed Amendments	
Consent Package—Constitution.....	78
Consent Package—Bylaws.....	78
Playing and Practice Seasons.....	78
Basketball—Number of Contests.....	79
Basketball—Number of Contests.....	79
Soccer Playing and Practice Seasons.....	79
Property Rights.....	80
NCAA Penalty Structure.....	81
Postseason Football.....	82
Coaches' Contracts.....	83
Football Coaching Staff .....	83
Scouting Limitations.....	84
Satisfactory Progress.....	84
Satisfactory Progress.....	86
Football Coaching Staff .....	87
Football Television .....	87
Resolution: Football Television.....	88
Football Television .....	89



## THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

Nall Avenue at 63rd Street  
P.O. Box 1906  
Mission, Kansas 66201  
913/384-3220

May 1982

NCAA, NCAA seal, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

Resolution: Football Television.....	91
NCAA Penalty Structure.....	91
Student-Athlete Employment.....	93
Complimentary Tickets.....	93
Permissible Expenses.....	94
Awards—Special Events.....	95
Five-Year Rule.....	95
Seasons of Competition.....	95
Eligibility—Freshmen.....	96
Eligibility—2,000 Rule.....	98
Eligibility—2,000 Rule.....	98
Transfer Rule—Waiver.....	99
Transfer Rule—Nonrecruited Student-Athlete.....	99
Transfer Rule—Discontinued Sport.....	99
Transfer—Junior College.....	100
Transfer—Junior College.....	100
Transfer Rule—Division III.....	100
Hardship—Junior College.....	100
Transfer Rule—Division III.....	101
Financial Aid—Division II.....	101
Financial Aid Definition.....	102
Financial Aid Definition.....	103
Financial Aid—Summer School.....	103
Financial Aid—Summer School.....	105
Financial Aid—Pell Grants.....	106
Financial Aid—Income.....	107
Maximum Awards—Division I Women.....	108
Maximum Awards—Division II Women.....	109
Financial Aid Limitations.....	109
Continuation of Business Session	
7. Proposed Amendments	
Maximum Awards—Division I-A Football.....	115
Maximum Awards—Division I-AA Football.....	118
Exempted Players—Division II.....	118
Sports Sponsorship.....	118
Membership Dues.....	119
Membership Classification—Division IV.....	120
Resolution: Multidivision Classification.....	120
Change of Division Membership.....	120

Sports Sponsorship Criteria.....	121
Division II Criteria.....	123
Division II Criteria.....	127
Division III Criteria.....	127
Tryouts.....	130
Recruiting Contacts.....	132
Recruiting Contacts.....	133
Women's Basketball Recruiting.....	133
Basketball Recruiting Season.....	134
Basketball Recruiting Season.....	134
Basketball Evaluation Periods.....	135
Institutional Letter of Intent.....	135
Recruiting—Publicity.....	136
Expense-Paid Visits.....	137
Complimentary Meal.....	138
Recruiting—Entertainment.....	139
Continuation of Championships.....	139
Eligibility for Division I Championships.....	141
Eligibility for Division I Championships.....	144
Eligibility for Division I Championships.....	144
Women's Indoor Track Championships.....	145
Women's Soccer Championships.....	146
Women's Skiing Championships.....	146
Institutional Eligibility for Championships.....	146
Resolution: Division I Men's Basketball.....	149
Resolution: NCAA Council.....	154
Resolution: Academic Trust Fund.....	154
8. Reports of the Committees on Committees.....	155
9. Report of the Nominating Committee.....	155

### III. Appendices

A. Legislative Proposals.....	A- 1
B. Convention Committees.....	A- 83
C. NCAA Convention Sites.....	A- 85
D. Past and Present NCAA Officers.....	A- 86



# 1982 NCAA Administrative Organization

## NCAA Officers

### President

JAMES FRANK  
President

Lincoln University

820 Chestnut  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

### Secretary-Treasurer

JOHN L. TONER  
Director of Athletics  
University of Connecticut, Box U-78  
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

### Executive Director

WALTER BYERS  
Nall Avenue at 63rd Street  
P.O. Box 1906  
Mission, Kansas 66201

## NCAA Council

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chair and secretary, respectively. Eight members of the Council are the eight district vice-presidents, each of whom is elected for four years. Twelve vice-presidents at large are elected, also for terms of four years.

*Term Expires*  
District 1 Vice-President—Andrew T. Mooradian . . . . . Jan. 1986\*

Director of Athletics  
University of New Hampshire  
Durham, New Hampshire 03824

District 2 Vice-President—Olav B. Kollevoll. . . . . Jan. 1983\*  
Director of Athletics; Professor of Physical Education  
Lafayette College  
Easton, Pennsylvania 18042

District 3 Vice-President—John W. Sawyer . . . . . Jan. 1984\*  
Professor of Mathematics and Computer Science  
Wake Forest University, Box 7401  
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27109

District 4 Vice-President—Richard G. Shrider . . . . . Jan. 1985\*  
Director of Athletics  
Miami University  
Oxford, Ohio 45056

District 5 Vice-President—Aldo A. Sebben . . . . . Jan. 1984\*  
Director of Men's Athletics  
Southwest Missouri State University, 901 South National  
Springfield, Missouri 65802

\*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

District 6 Vice-President—Charles H. Samson . . . . . Jan. 1985\*  
Vice-President for Planning  
Texas A&M University  
College Station, Texas 77843

District 7 Vice-President—Richard W. Burns . . . . . Jan. 1986\*  
Professor of Curriculum, College of Education  
University of Texas, El Paso  
El Paso, Texas 79968

District 8 Vice-President—John R. Davis . . . . . Jan. 1983\*  
Associate Dean and Director, Oregon Agricultural  
Experiment Station, Ag Hall 127  
Oregon State University  
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

Vice-President at Large—Francis W. Bonner . . . . . Jan. 1985\*  
Vice-President and Provost  
Furman University  
Greenville, South Carolina 29613

Vice-President at Large—Judith M. Brame . . . . . Jan. 1986\*  
Director of Women's Athletics  
California State University, Northridge  
Physical Education Department, 18111 Nordhoff Street  
Northridge, California 91330

Vice-President at Large—Howard Davis. . . . . Jan. 1983\*  
Director of Athletics; Head, Physical Education Department  
Tuskegee Institute  
Tuskegee Institute, Alabama 36088

Vice-President at Large—Judith R. Holland . . . . . Jan. 1983\*  
Senior Associate Director of Athletics  
University of California, Los Angeles, 405 Hilgard Avenue  
Los Angeles, California 90024

Vice-President at Large—Elizabeth A. Kruczek . . . . . Jan. 1986\*  
Director of Athletics  
Fitchburg State College, 160 Pearl Street  
Fitchburg, Massachusetts 01420

Vice-President at Large—Edwin W. Lawrence. . . . . Jan. 1984\*  
Director of Athletics  
Cheyney State College, Creek Road  
Cheyney, Pennsylvania 19319

Vice-President at Large—Edwin D. Muto . . . . . Jan. 1985\*  
Director of Men's Athletics  
State University of New York, Buffalo  
3435 Main Street  
Buffalo, New York 14214

Vice-President at Large—Gwendolyn Norrell . . . . . Jan. 1985\*  
Professor, Counseling Center  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

Vice-President at Large—Donald M. Russell. . . . . Jan. 1984\*  
Chair, Department of Physical Education; Director of Athletics  
Wesleyan University  
Middletown, Connecticut 06457

\*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

## 1982 NCAA Administrative Organization

### Council (Continued)

- Vice-President at Large*—P. LaVerne Sweat ..... Jan. 1984\*  
 Coordinator of Women's Athletic Program  
 Hampton Institute  
 Hampton, Virginia 23668
- Vice-President at Large*—Kenneth J. Weller ..... Jan. 1983\*  
 President  
 Central College  
 Pella, Iowa 50219
- Vice-President at Large*—Elmer W. Yoest ..... Jan. 1986\*  
 Director of Athletics  
 Otterbein College, Rike Center  
 Westerville, Ohio 43081

\*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

## 1982 Division Steering Committees

*The Divisions I, II and III Steering Committees are subcommittees of the Council, as established in Constitution 5-1(a)-(5). The 20 vice-presidents of the Association, who compose the Council, represent their respective divisions as members of the division steering committees. For purposes of meetings conducted separately from regular meetings of the Council, each steering committee appoints additional members to serve on the committee, subject to approval of the Council and limited to a number not exceeding the number of Council members on the steering committee.*

### Division I Steering Committee

Chair—John R. Davis

- \*Francis W. Bonner, Vice-President and Provost  
 Furman University, Greenville, South Carolina 29613
- \*Richard W. Burns, Professor of Curriculum  
 University of Texas, El Paso, Texas 79968
- G. Jean Cerra, Associate Director of Athletics  
 University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri 65205
- \*John R. Davis, Associate Dean and Director, Oregon  
 Agricultural Experiment Station, Ag Hall 127  
 Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon 97331
- Chalmers W. Elliott, Director of Athletics  
 University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242
- Susan B. Feamster, Assistant Director of Athletics/Women's Sports  
 University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky 40506
- Porter L. Fortune, Chancellor  
 University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677
- Mary Alice Hill, Associate Director of Athletics  
 San Diego State University, San Diego, California 92182
- \*Judith R. Holland, Senior Associate Director of Athletics  
 University of California, 405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles,  
 California 90024
- \*Olav B. Kollevoll, Director of Athletics; Prof. of Physical Education  
 Lafayette College, Easton, Pennsylvania 18042
- Noah N. Langdale, President  
 Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia 30303
- William A. Miller, Professor and Chair, Department of Higher  
 Education  
 North Texas State University, Denton, Texas 76201
- \*Andrew T. Mooradian, Director of Athletics  
 University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire 03824
- \*Gwendolyn Norrell, Professor, Counseling Center  
 Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824
- Sandra Norrell-Thomas, Associate Director of Athletics  
 Howard University, Washington, D.C. 20059
- Alvin R. Paul, Director of Athletics  
 Columbia University, Dodge Physical Fitness Center, Room 436  
 New York, New York 10027

\*Members of NCAA Council.

\*Charles H. Samson, Vice-President for Planning  
Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843  
\*John W. Sawyer, Professor of Mathematics and Computer Science  
Wake Forest University, Box 7401, Winston-Salem,  
North Carolina 27109

\*Richard G. Shrider, Director of Athletics  
Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 45056  
Richard A. Young, Director of Athletics  
Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078

#### **Division II Steering Committee**

Chair—Aldo A. Sebben

Joan Board, Coordinator of Women's Athletics  
Grand Valley State College, Allendale, Michigan 49401

\*Judith M. Brame, Director of Women's Athletics  
California State University, Northridge, California 91330

\*Howard Davis, Director of Athletics  
Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama 36088

Lonnie J. Davis, Director of Athletics  
Northern Kentucky University, Highland Heights, Kentucky  
41076

Asa N. Green, President

Livingston University, Livingston, Alabama 35470

\*Edwin W. Lawrence, Director of Athletics

Cheyney College, Cheyney, Pennsylvania 19319

Milton J. Piepul, Chair, Dept. of Athletics & Physical Education;  
Director of Athletics

American International College, 1000 State Street  
Springfield, Massachusetts 01109

\*Aldo A. Sebben, Director of Men's Athletics

Southwest Missouri State University, 901 South National,  
Springfield, Missouri 65802

Ade L. Sponberg, Director of Athletics

North Dakota State University, Fargo, North Dakota 58105

\*P. La Verne Sweat, Coordinator of Women's Athletic Program  
Hampton Institute, Hampton, Virginia 23668

#### **Division III Steering Committee**

Chair—Donald M. Russell

Thomas M. Kinder, Director of Athletics

Bridgewater College, Bridgewater, Virginia 22812

\*Elizabeth A. Kruczek, Director of Athletics

Fitchburg State College, Fitchburg, Massachusetts 01420

Mary Jean Mulvaney, Chair, Dept. of Physical Education & Athletics  
University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637

\*Edwin D. Muto, Director of Men's Athletics

State University of New York, 3435 Main Street, Buffalo, New  
York 14214

\*Members of NCAA Council.

\*Members of NCAA Council

\*Donald M. Russell, Chair, Dept. of Physical Education; Director of  
Athletics

Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut 06457

Robert T. Shields, Director of Athletics

Fairleigh Dickinson University, 285 Madison Avenue, Madison,  
New Jersey 07940

Judith M. Sweet, Director of Athletics

University of California (San Diego), LaJolla, California 92093

Patricia A. Thompson, Assistant Director of Athletics

Elmira College, Elmira, New York 14901

\*Kenneth J. Weller, President

Central College, Pella, Iowa 50219

\*Elmer W. Yoest, Director of Athletics

Otterbein College, Westerville, Ohio 43081

## NCAA Executive Committee

*The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer shall be ex officio members of the Executive Committee. The remaining 10 members of the committee are elected by the Council for a period of one year. At least one new member shall be elected each year. Date of first election is shown in parentheses.*

- Ernest C. Casale (Jan. 1980)  
Director of Athletics  
Temple University  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
- Linda K. Estes (Jan. 1981)  
Director of Women's Athletics  
University of New Mexico  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131
- J. William Grice (Jan. 1977)  
Chair, Department of Physical Education;  
Director of Athletics  
Case Western Reserve University, 10900 Euclid Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
- Fred Jacoby (Jan. 1982)  
Commissioner  
Mid-American Athletic Conference  
2000 West Henderson Road, Suite 230  
Columbus, Ohio 43220
- Henry T. Lowe (Jan. 1979)  
Professor of Law  
University of Missouri, 218 Tate Hall  
Columbia, Missouri 65201
- Seaver Peters (Jan. 1977)  
Director of Athletics  
Dartmouth College  
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755
- Robert F. Riedel (Jan. 1981)  
Director of Athletics  
State University College, Geneseo  
Geneseo, New York 14454
- Charley Scott (Jan. 1980)  
Associate Academic Vice-President  
University of Alabama, P.O. Box 1933  
University, Alabama 35486
- Joe L. Singleton (Jan. 1977)  
Director of Athletics  
University of California, Davis  
Department of Physical Education  
Davis, California 95616
- Mary M. Zimmerman (Jan. 1981)  
Associate Director of Athletics  
University of South Dakota, Dakota Dome  
Vermillion, South Dakota 57069

## NCAA National Office

### General Administration

- Walter Byers, Executive Director  
Louis J. Spry, Controller  
Marjorie Fieber, Business Manager  
David P. Selfert, Executive Assistant  
Fannie B. Vaughan, Administrative Assistant  
Eric D. Zemper, Research Coordinator  
Skipper A. Zipperlen, Administrative Assistant

### Championships

- Thomas W. Jernstedt, Assistant Executive Director  
Ruth M. Berkey, Assistant Executive Director and  
Director of Women's Championships  
Jerry A. Miles, Director of Men's Championships  
Patricia E. Bork, Assistant Director of Championships  
Richard D. Hunter, Assistant Director of Championships  
Ralph McFillen, Assistant Director of Championships  
Dennis L. Poppe, Assistant Director of Championships  
Cynthia L. Smith, Assistant Director of Championships  
Patricia W. Wall, Assistant Director of Championships

### Communications

- Thomas C. Hansen, Assistant Executive Director  
David E. Cawood, Director of Public Relations  
C. Dennis Cryder, Director of Productions  
John T. Waters, Director of Promotion  
James W. Shaffer, Assistant Director of Productions  
Jim Van Valkenburg, Director of Statistics  
Steve Boda, Associate Director of Statistics  
Michael F. Bowyer, Administrative Assistant  
Jenniffer A. Boyer, Production Coordinator  
Timothy W. Gleason, Administrative Assistant  
Gina L. McNeal, Administrative Assistant  
Robert A. Rogers, Administrative Assistant  
Shirley Whitacre, Membership Coordinator  
James F. Wright, Statistics Coordinator  
Ron Schwartz, Director, Television News Service  
888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019

### Legislative Services and Enforcement

- William B. Hunt, Assistant Executive Director  
S. David Berst, Director of Enforcement  
Stephen R. Morgan, Director of Legislative Services  
Hale McMenamin, Assistant Director of Enforcement  
Ronald J. Stratton, Assistant Director of Enforcement  
Thomas E. Yeager, Assistant Director of Legislative Services  
Janice I. Bump, Administrative Assistant  
David A. Didion, Enforcement Representative  
Michael M. Gilleran, Enforcement Representative  
Michael S. Glazier, Enforcement Representative  
Robert J. Minnix, Enforcement Representative  
Louis A. Onofrio, Enforcement Representative  
Dale Smith, Enforcement Representative  
Charles E. Smrt, Enforcement Representative

### **Publishing**

Ted C. Tow, *Assistant Executive Director*  
Wallace I. Renfro, *Director of Publishing*  
David Pickle, *Managing Editor, NCAA News*  
Lavonne G. Seifert, *Assistant Director of Publishing*  
Maxine R. Alejos, *Circulation Manager*  
Bruce L. Howard, *Publications Editor*  
Timothy D. Schmad, *Publications Editor*  
James A. Sheldon, *Publications Editor*

## **76th ANNUAL CONVENTION DELEGATES AND VISITORS**

### **Active Member Institutions**

#### **District 1**

American International College: Milton J. Piepul  
Amherst College: Peter J. Gooding  
Assumption College: Andrew Laska  
Babson College: Robert E. Hartwell  
Bates College: Robert W. Hatch  
Bentley College: Elwood N. Shields  
Boston College: Mary Miller Carson, William J. Flynn, Rev. Joseph L. Shea  
Boston State College: Mary R. Barrett  
Boston University: Richard Fecteau, Averill Haines, John B. Simpson  
Bowdoin College: Sidney J. Watson  
Brandeis University: Nicholas Rodis  
Bridgeport, University of: Francis W. Poisson  
Bridgewater State College: Harry A. Lehmann  
Brown University: John C. Parry, Richard C. Sardella, Howard R. Swearer, Joan W. Taylor  
Bryant College: Leon A. Drury  
Central Connecticut State College: Lowell D. Lukas, William M. Moore  
Clark University: Walter P. Halas  
Colby College: Richard J. McGee  
Connecticut, University of: Rita L. Custeau, John L. Toner  
Connecticut College: Charles Luce  
Dartmouth College: David T. McLaughlin, Seaver Peters  
Eastern Connecticut State College: William P. Holowaty  
Fairfield University: C. Donald Cook  
Fitchburg State College: Elizabeth A. Kruczek  
Framingham State College: Lawrence P. Boyd  
Hartford, University of: Gordon F. McCullough  
Harvard University: Patricia Miller, John P. Reardon Jr.  
Holy Cross University: Ronald S. Perry  
Keene State College: Joanne A. Fortunato  
Lowell, University of: James Ciszek  
Maine, University of, Orono: Richard C. Bowers, Mary Jo Walkup, Harold S. Westerman  
Massachusetts, University of, Amherst: David Bischoff, Frank P. McInerney  
Massachusetts, University of, Boston: Charlie Titus  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Royce N. Flippin Jr.  
Middlebury College: G. Thomas Lawson  
Mount Holyoke College: Mary Park Morison, Leslie J. Poolman  
New England College: George R. Hamilton

New Hampshire, University of: Frank J. Bachich, Gail A. Bigglestone,  
C. Robert Keese, Andrew T. Mooradian  
New Haven, University of: William M. Leete Jr.  
North Adams State College: Rodger Summers, Joseph Zavattaro  
Northeastern University: Irwin Cohen, John A. Freeman, Joseph P.  
Zabitski  
Norwich University: Joseph G. Sabol  
Providence College: David R. Gavitt  
Rhode Island, University of: John R. Chuckran  
Rhode Island College: William Baird  
St. Anselm College: Theodore S. Paulauskas  
St. Michael's College: Edward P. Markey  
Salem State College: John D. Galaris  
Smith College: Lawrence A. Fink  
Southern Connecticut State College: Raymond W. DeFrancesco,  
Lawrence Fitzgerald  
Springfield College: Edward S. Steitz  
Stonehill College: Thomas J. Follard  
Trinity College: Karl Kurth Jr.  
Tufts University: Rocco J. Carzo  
U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Frank Kapral  
Vermont, University of: Richard Farnham, Ben Forsyth, Denis Lam-  
bert  
Wesleyan University: Donald M. Russell  
Western Connecticut State College: John A. Barrett  
Westfield State College: F. Paul Bogan  
Williams College: Robert Odell  
Worcester Polytechnic Institute: James P. Culppepper  
Yale University: James G. Holgate, Christopher B. Morris, Frank B.  
Ryan

## District 2

Adelphi University: Janet L. Ficke, Laurence C. Keating Jr.  
Albany, State University of New York: Robert M. Ford  
Alfred University: Eugene Castrovillo  
Allegheny College: Norman A. Sundstrom  
American University: Robert H. Frailey  
Bernard M. Baruch College: William Eng  
Binghamton, State University of New York: Nell C. Jackson, Robert  
D. Kreidler  
Bloomsburg State College: H. Cecil Turberville  
Brookport, State University College: Charles L. Crawford  
Brooklyn College: Joseph A. Margolis  
Bucknell University: Bruce A. Corrie, Robert A. Latour  
Buffalo, State University College: Howard B. MacAdam  
Buffalo, State University of New York: Norman Baker, Edwin D. Muto  
C. W. Post College: Patricia Lamb Kennedy, Wayne Sunderland  
Canisius College: Daniel P. Starr  
Carnegie-Mellon University: James E. Banner  
Catholic University: Brian McCall  
Cheyney State College: Edwin W. Lawrence  
Clarion State College: Frank Lignelli

Clarkson College of Technology: John Hantz  
Colgate University: Frederick H. Dunlap, Braden Houston  
Columbia University: Paul Fernandes, Alvin R. Paul  
Cornell University: Martha Arnett, Nelson E. Bobb, Terry R. Mallett,  
Michael L. Slive  
Cortland, State University College: Charles W. Winters  
Delaware, University of: John L. Burmeister, Scotty Duncan, David  
M. Nelson  
Delaware State College: Nelson E. Townsend  
Delaware Valley College: Frank Wolfgang  
Dickinson College: David L. Watkins  
District of Columbia, University of: Emma J. Best, Orby Z. Moss Jr.  
Drew University: Madeline Kenyon  
Drexel University: John Semanik, Mary Semanik  
Duquesne University: John M. Manning  
East Stroudsburg State College: Dennis D. Bell, Clyde H. Witman  
Edinboro State College: James K. McDonald  
Elmira College: Paul H. Brand, Patricia A. Thompson  
Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison: Robert T. Shields  
Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck: Richard W. Holub, Robert V.  
Metz, Florence A. Phillips, Stanley V. Wright  
Fordham University: Joseph J. McGowan Jr., David Rice  
Franklin and Marshall College: Linda Hershey, William A. Marshall  
Fredonia, State University College: Patrick R. Damore  
Gannon University: Howard Elwell  
Geneseo, State University College: Robert F. Riedel  
George Mason University: Robert Epskamp, Donald J. Mash, Robert  
Pennington  
George Washington University: Robert K. Faris  
Georgetown University: Jesse A. Mann, Francis X. Rienzo  
Gettysburg College: Eugene M. Haas  
Glassboro State College: Michael Brighia, Maurice G. Verbeke  
Hampton Institute: Ollie Bowman, Walter L. Lovett, P. LaVerne  
Sweat  
Hartwick College: Thomas H. Greene  
Haverford College: Dana W. Swan  
Hobart College: Michael J. Hanna  
Hofstra University: Robert M. Getchell  
Howard University: Henry Jones, Leo F. Miles, Sondra Norrell-Thom-  
as  
Hunter College: Charles Brown  
Indiana University (Pa.): John Chellman, Herman L. Sledzik  
Inter-American University: Luis F. Sambolin  
Iona College: Richard Mazzuto  
Ithaca College: Robert C. Deming  
John Jay College: Wallace M. Pina  
King's College: John J. Dorish  
Kutztown State College: Irv Hess  
Lafayette College: Olav B. Kollevoll  
La Salle College: William D. Bradshaw, Raymond P. Heath  
Lehigh University: William B. Leckonby, Judith Turner



Le Moyne College: Thomas J. Niland Jr.  
 Lock Haven State College: Charles A. Eberle  
 Long Island University: Jerry Donner  
 Loyola College: Thomas J. O'Connor  
 Manhattan College: Gerald Oswald, John J. Powers  
 Manhattanville College: Joel G. Daunic  
 Mansfield State College: Richard E. Finley  
 Marist College: Dick Quinn  
 Maryland, University of, Baltimore County: James Mohr, E. Richard Watts Jr.  
 Maryland, University of, Eastern Shore: Joel C. Mack  
 Medgar Evers College: Paul Bobb  
 Mercyhurst College: Michael J. Cusack  
 Messiah College: Layton Shoemaker  
 Millersville State College: Gene A. Carpenter  
 Monmouth College: Godfrey Buzzelli  
 Montclair State College: William P. Dioguardi  
 Muhlenberg College: Joseph Now  
 New Jersey Institute of Technology: Robert F. Swanson  
 New York, City College of: Richard Zerneck  
 New York Institute of Technology: Samuel Stern  
 New York Maritime College: State University of: Roger Reinhart  
 New York University: Daniel E. Quilty  
 Niagara University: Gil Licata  
 Oswego, State University College: John L. Spring  
 Pace University: Peter X. Finnerty  
 Pennsylvania, University of: Charles Harris  
 Pennsylvania State University: John J. Coyle, Edward M. Czekaj,  
 Della Durant, Richard J. Lucas, Joseph V. Paterno, Robert A. Patterson, James I. Tarman  
 Pittsburgh, University of: John O. Bolvin, Sandra J. Bullman, Walter P. Cummins, Casimir J. Myslinski  
 Potsdam, State University College: Conrad A. Bautz  
 Pratt Institute: Reinhold R. Jabusch  
 Princeton University: Samuel C. Howell, Robert J. Myslik  
 Purchase, State University College: Artie Paul Blouin  
 Queens College: Barbara Leshinsky  
 Ramapo College: Robert N. Hartman  
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Robert F. Ducatte  
 Robert Morris College: C. Robert Miller, Robert W. Norberg  
 Rochester, University of: Donald C. Smith  
 Rochester Institute of Technology: Fred W. Smith, Louis W. Spiotti  
 Rutgers University, New Brunswick: Frederick E. Gruninger, Donald Heilman  
 Rutgers University, Newark: Steven Senko, Gene A. Vincenti  
 St. Bonaventure University: Lawrence J. Weise  
 St. Francis College (N.Y.): Carlo Tramonozzi  
 St. John's University (N.Y.): John W. Kaiser  
 St. Joseph's University (Pa.): William Larkin, Michael L. Schultz  
 St. Lawrence University: Robert J. Sheldon  
 St. Peter's College: Barbara Church  
 Scranton, University of: Gary Wodder

Shippensburg State College: John E. Hubley  
 Slippery Rock State College: Cheryl L. Levick, Robert A. Oliver  
 Staten Island, College of: Joseph Barresi  
 Stony Brook, State University of New York: John W. Ramsey  
 Susquehanna University: Donald Harnum  
 Swarthmore College: David Smoyer  
 Syracuse University: David H. Bennett, Jake Crouthamel, Richard Gibney, Doris R. Soladay  
 Temple University: Ernest C. Casale  
 Thiel College: John A. Dickason  
 Towson State University: Joseph H. McMullen  
 Trenton State College: June Walker  
 U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: William T. Lai  
 U.S. Military Academy: Brig. Gen. Frederick A. Smith Jr., Carl F. Ullrich  
 U.S. Naval Academy: Capt. J. O. Coppedge  
 Union College: Richard Sakala  
 Ursinus College: Robert R. Davidson  
 Vassar College: Richard Becker, Robert Colyer  
 Villanova University: Robert Langran  
 Wagner College: Walt Hameline  
 Washington and Jefferson College: Paul L. Reardon  
 West Chester State College: Richard B. Yoder  
 West Virginia University: Forest J. Bowman, Fred A. Schaus  
 Widener University: William B. Manlove Jr.  
 Wilkes College: Doris Saracino  
 William Paterson College: Arthur Eason

### District 3

Alabama, University of, Birmingham: Avie Bridges, Jerry D. Young  
 Alabama, University of: Sam D. Bailey, Jeff Coleman, Ann Marie Lawler, Charley Scott, Joab Thomas  
 Alabama State University: Tommy L. Frederick  
 Albany State College: Wilburn Campbell Jr.  
 Appalachian State University: Judy Clarke, C. H. Gilstrap, John E. Thomas, Roger E. Thomas  
 Auburn University: Wilford S. Bailey, John Cochran, Joanna Davenport, L. Oval Jaynes  
 Augusta College: Dexter Burley, George A. Christenberry  
 Austin Peay State University: Pamela M. Davidson, Johnny Miller  
 Averett College: Vesa Hiltunen  
 Baptist College: Howard Bagwell, Clyde Odom  
 Bellarmine College: David P. O'Toole, James R. Spalding  
 Bethune-Cookman College: Lloyd C. Johnson  
 Biscayne College: J. T. Hoy  
 Bridgewater College: Mary Frances Heishman, Thomas M. Kinder  
 Campbell University: Wendell L. Carr  
 Central Florida, University of: J. P. Goree, Henry Kennedy  
 Centre College: Kitty R. Baird, Charles Vahlkamp  
 Christopher Newport College: R. Bev Vaughan  
 Citadel: Maj. Gen. James A. Grimsley, Edward L. Teague  
 Clark College: Leonidas S. Epps

Clemson University: H. C. McLellan, B. J. Skelton, Kenneth N. Vickery  
 Columbus College: Frank M. Clements, Billy D. McGee  
 Coppin State College: Ronald K. DeSouza  
 Davidson College: Edward G. Farrell  
 Delta State University: Milton L. Bradley, Bradford W. Hovious, Travis Parker, Kent Wyatt  
 Duke University: Tom Butters, E. J. McDonald  
 East Carolina University: O. Kenneth Karr, Ernest W. Schwarz  
 East Tennessee State University: Ronald E. Beller, Charles Clark, Doug Messer  
 Eastern Kentucky University: Donald G. Combs  
 Elizabeth City State University: Thomas L. Caldwell, Ola A. Goss  
 Emory University: Clyde Partin  
 Fayetteville State University: John D. Marshall Jr.  
 Fisk University: Harriet Kimbro Hamilton, John C. Martin  
 Florida, University of: William Carr, Richard C. Giannini, Mandell Glucksberg, John A. Nattress, Marilyn Weiss  
 Florida A&M University: Sarah E. Hill, Charles U. Smith, Walter L. Smith, Roosevelt Wilson  
 Florida International University: Arthur W. Herriott, Nancy J. Olson  
 Florida Southern College: Hal Smeltzly  
 Florida State University: Bob Goin, James P. Jones, Cecil W. Ingram, Barbara Palmer  
 Fort Valley State College: Douglas T. Porter  
 Frostburg State College: Kenneth Kutler  
 Furman University: Dutch Baughman, Francis W. Bonner  
 Georgia, University of: Lee R. Hayley, William M. Powell  
 Georgia Institute of Technology: Homer C. Rice, William M. Sangster  
 Georgia Southern College: Dale W. Lick, David B. Wagner  
 Georgia State University: Noah N. Langdale Jr., William S. Patrick  
 Hampden-Sydney College: Wilfred R. Chassey  
 Jacksonville State University: Jerry N. Cole  
 James Madison University: Paul S. Griffin  
 Johns Hopkins University: Ben L. Carnevale, S. Dean Ehlers  
 Johnson C. Smith University: Robert H. Scott  
 Johnson C. Smith University: Edward C. McGirt  
 Kentucky, University of: Susan B. Feamster, Clifford O. Hagan, William L. Matthews Jr.  
 Kentucky State University: Ethel L. McLendon  
 Lane College: Willie G. Shaw  
 Liberty Baptist College: A. Brent Bledsoe  
 Livingston University: Asa N. Green  
 Longwood College: Carolyn V. Hodges  
 Louisiana State University: Paul F. Dietzel, Patricia Newman, Charlie W. Roberts Jr.  
 Louisville, University of: Burt L. Monroe Jr., William C. Olsen  
 Lynchburg College: William H. Shellenberger  
 Marshall University: Robert B. Hayes, Dorothy Hicks, Linda S. Holmes, Lynn Snyder, Harold L. Willey  
 Maryland, University of, College Park: Robert L. Gluckstern, Charles A. Taff, Suzanne Tyler

Maryville College: Art Ogden  
 Memphis State University: Thomas G. Carpenter, Ford Haynes Jr., Billy J. Murphy, Bob Patterson, Elma Roane  
 Mercer College: Dana Robinson  
 Miami, University of: Harry C. Mallios, George Onoprienko  
 Middle Tennessee State University: Jimmy Earle, Otis L. Floyd, Sam H. Ingram  
 Mississippi, University of: Warner Alford, Jeanne Taylor  
 Mississippi College: John W. Legg, Lewis Nobles, John M. Williams  
 Mississippi State University: Libba Birmingham, Carl Maddox  
 Morehead State University: G. E. Moran Jr.  
 New Orleans, University of: Ronald J. Maestri, Rich Olson  
 Nicholls State University: Vernon F. Galliano, Don Landry, Gary Olen, Gary J. Whipple  
 Norfolk State University: William L. Archie, William E. Moore  
 North Alabama, University of: Roy S. Stevens  
 North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill: John D. Swofford, Benson R. Wilcox  
 North Carolina, University of, Charlotte: Thomas C. Turner, Clyde L. Walker  
 North Carolina, University of, Greensboro: Tony Ladd  
 North Carolina, University of, Wilmington: William J. Brooks  
 North Carolina A&T State University: Bert C. Piggott, Albert E. Smith  
 North Carolina State University: Robert S. Bryan, Nora Lynn Finch, Frank Weedon, Nash N. Winstead  
 Northern Kentucky University: Lonnie J. Davis  
 Old Dominion University: Mikki Flowers, James Jarrett  
 Pembroke State University: Lacey E. Gane, Paul R. Givens  
 Radford University: Donald N. Dedmon, Chuck Taylor, Gary Upp  
 Richmond, University of: Charles S. Boone, Albert C. Dawson  
 Roanoke College: Edgar L. Green  
 Rollins College: Gloria E. Crosby  
 St. Andrews Presbyterian College: Julian L. Smith, JoAnn Williams  
 St. Leo College: Norman D. Kaye  
 St. Mary's College: Tom Weingartner  
 St. Paul's College: Joe E. Thompson  
 Samford University: H. Evan Zeiger  
 Savannah State College: Wendell G. Rayburn  
 South, University of the: Walter Bryant Jr., Jill Thomas  
 South Alabama, University of: James H. Boyd, Joe Gottfried  
 South Carolina, University of: Ron Dickerson, John Moore, William F. Putnam  
 South Carolina State College: Willis C. Ham, Victor E. Kerr Jr., M. Maceo Nance Jr.  
 South Florida, University of: Richard T. Bowers, Phyllis P. Marshall  
 Southeastern Louisiana University: Robert C. Brown, Maria Ferguson, Leo P. Jones  
 Southern Mississippi, University of: Roland H. Dale, Pete Taylor, Sidney E. Weatherford  
 Southern University, New Orleans: Artis M. Davenport  
 Southwestern College: Edmunds White  
 Stetson University: Fred H. Cooper, Kelly Jordan



Tampa, University of: Robert M. Birrenkott  
Tennessee, University of: Chattanooga: Frederick W. Obeare, Charles M. Temple, Harold B. Wilkes  
Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: H. Alan Lasater, Gloria Ray, G. Robert Woodruff  
Tennessee, University of, Martin: Ernest W. Blythe Jr., Ray Mears, Charles E. Smith  
Tennessee State University: Sterlin Adams, Samuel R. Whitmon  
Tennessee Technological University: Thurston Banks, David W. Coffey, Arliss L. Roaden  
Tougaloo College: James C. Coleman  
Troy State University: Eugene H. Sherman, Robert E. Stewart  
Tulane University: Elizabeth B. Delery, James T. Rogers, Hindman Wall  
Tuksgee Institute: Howard Davis  
Valdosta State College: Joe A. Gore, William C. Grant, Dave Waples  
Vanderbilt University: George Bennett, Paul Harrawood, Emily H. Harsh, Roy Kramer  
Virginia, University of: Richard D. Schultz, D. Alan Williams  
Virginia Commonwealth University: Lewis B. Mills  
Virginia Military Institute: Tom Joynes  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute: William G. Dooley, Jo K. Kafer, William B. Matthews, James I. Robertson  
Virginia State University: Roosevelt Cunningham, Claude Flythe  
Virginia Union University: Willard Bailey  
Wake Forest University: Gene E. Hooks, John W. Sawyer  
Washington and Lee University: William D. McHenry  
Washington College: Edward L. Athey  
West Georgia College: James C. Stokes  
Western Carolina University: Gurney Chambers, Robert L. Waters  
Western Kentucky University: Pam Herriford, Jim Richards  
Western Maryland College: Richard A. Clower  
William and Mary, College of: Jim Copeland, Thomas G. Graves, Mildred B. West  
Winston-Salem State University: Clarence E. Gaines

#### District 4

Akron, University of: Gordon K. Larson  
Albion College: Frank Joranko  
Alma College: William Klenk  
Ashland College: Fred M. Martinelli, Robert L. Wendling  
Aurora College: Sam S. Bedrosian  
Baldwin-Wallace College: Louis A. Barone  
Ball State University: Al Brown, Richard C. McKee, Coranell Rossow, George E. Swafford  
Beloit College: Ed DeGeorge  
Bowling Green State University: Carole Huston, Marvin L. Kumler, James W. Lessig  
Butler University: William L. Sylvester  
Capital University: Armin P. Langholz  
Carleton College: Bill Huyck  
Carroll College: DeWayne King

Carthage College: Arthur Keller  
Case Western Reserve University: J. William Grice  
Central Michigan University: Theodore Kjolhede, Fran Koenig, Douglas W. Nance  
Central State University: Lu D. Wims  
Chicago, University of: Patricia R. Kirby, Robert V. Larsen, Mary Jean Mulvaney  
Cincinnati, University of: Michael B. McGee, Gordon S. Skinner, Jean E. Tuerck  
Cleveland State University: Robert F. Busbey, Merle J. Levin  
Concordia College (Minn.): Armin Pipho  
Dayton, University of: Elaine Dreidame  
Denison University: Theodore H. Barclay, Trevor Gamble  
DePaul University: Thomas M. Croak, Edward J. Manetta Jr.  
DePaul University: Robert D. Loring  
Detroit, University of: Brad Kinsman  
Eastern Illinois University: Jimmie L. Franklin, R. C. Johnson, Ron Paap, Joan Schmidt  
Eastern Michigan University: Alex Agase, John Fountain, George W. Linn, Lucy Parker  
Elmhurst College: Allen Ackerman  
Evansville, University of: James A. Byers, J. Robert Knott  
Ferris State College: Dean Davenport  
Grand Valley State College: Joan Board, George M. MacDonald  
Gustavus Adolphus College: James M. Malmquist  
Hamline University: Richard Tressel  
Illinois, University of, Champaign: Karol A. Kahrs, John E. Nowak, Neale R. Stoner  
Illinois, University of, Chicago Circle: Dorothy S. Abbinanti, William Roetzheim  
Illinois College: E. Joe Brooks  
Illinois Institute of Technology: James W. Vice  
Indiana Central University: Kenneth Borden, William A. Bright  
Indiana State University, Evansville: Donald D. Bennett, Charles J. Bertram  
Indiana University: Ralph N. Floyd, Jack R. Wentworth  
Iowa, University of: C. W. Elliott, Gary Kurdelmeier, Robert F. Ray  
John Carroll University: James M. Lavin, Jerry Schweickert  
Kent State University: Paul V. Amodio, Doris F. Chambers, Charles W. Ingler  
Kenyon College: Jeffrey Vennell  
Knox College: Joe Campanelli  
Lake Superior State College: Ronald R. Cooper  
Lawrence University: Ronald D. Roberts  
Lewis University: Irish O'Reilly  
Loyola University: Loyal K. Park, Samuel D. Ramenofsky  
Macalester College: Dennis J. Keihn  
Marquette University: Walter W. Fredricks  
Miami University: Charles Heimsch, Richard G. Shrider, Karen Womack  
Michigan, University of: Thomas J. Anton, Donald B. Canham, Gwen Cruzat, Donald Lund, Will Perry

Michigan State University: Cecil Mackey, Gwendolyn Norrell, Nicholas Vista, Douglas W. Weaver  
 Michigan Technological University: K. Ross Johnson, Ted Kearly  
 Millikin University: Merle W. Chapman, Harriett Crannell  
 Minnesota, University of, Duluth: Ralph A. Romano  
 Minnesota, University of, Minneapolis: Robert J. Geary, Paul R. Giel,  
 Jo-Ida C. Hansen, Nils Hasselmo, Robert A. Stein  
 Monmouth College: David Ostrander  
 Mount Union College: Truman D. Turnquist  
 North Central College: Allen B. Carius, Dennis Ryan  
 North Park College: Carroll J. Peterson  
 Northern Illinois University: Robert J. Brigham, McKinley Davis,  
 Susie Jones, John Pembroke, John J. Templin, Nancy M. Vedral  
 Northern Michigan University: Gil Canale, Thomas L. Knauss, R.  
 Thomas Peters Jr.  
 Northwestern University: Frederick Hemke, Ken Kraft, Ted Leland,  
 Sandra McCullough, Doug Single, Marilyn Tucker  
 Northwood Institute: John B. Finn  
 Notre Dame, University of: Eugene F. Corrigan, Astrid E. Hotvedt,  
 Rev. Edmund P. Joyce, Jack Stephens  
 Oakland University: Beverly K. Berger, Cynthia Hill, Glenn A. Jackson, Corey Van Fleet  
 Oberlin College: George Andrews, Joseph W. Gurtis Jr.  
 Ohio State University: Phyllis J. Bailey, Hugh D. Hindman, James L.  
 Jones, William R. Nester, Harold Shechter, Larry R. Thompson  
 Ohio University: Harold N. McElhane, Fred Picard  
 Ohio Wesleyan University: Richard D. Gordin  
 Otterbein College: Elmer W. Yoest  
 Principia College: John F. Bower  
 Purdue University: Gilbert S. Banker, George S. King Jr., Carol  
 Mertler  
 Ripon College: Charles L. Larson  
 St. Cloud State University: Noel W. Olson  
 St. Norbert College: Albert E. Negratti  
 St. Olaf College: Robert D. Gelle  
 St. Thomas, College of: Frank Mach  
 Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: Eldon M. Bigham, James  
 R. Buck  
 Toledo, University of: Vernon M. Smith, Charles Snyder, John W.  
 Stoepler  
 Valparaiso University: William L. Steinbrecher  
 Wabash College: Robert L. Henry  
 Wayne State University: Dorothy E. Dreyer, Chalmers G. Hixson  
 Western Illinois University: Tony Karas, Gil Peterson  
 Western Michigan University: Leo C. Vander Beek, Tom H. Wondeling  
 Wheaton College: Jack Swartz  
 Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay: Don Hardin, Charles Ihrke  
 Wisconsin, University of, Madison: Otto Breitenbach, Frank J. Remington  
 Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee: Michael C. Greenisen, Frank E.  
 Horton, Daryl A. Leonard

Wisconsin, University of, Oshkosh: James J. Flood  
 Wisconsin, University of, Platteville: George Chryst  
 Wisconsin, University of, Stevens Point: Virgil A. Thiesfeld  
 Wisconsin, University of, Stout: Warren C. Bowlus  
 Wisconsin, University of, Whitewater: Forrest Perkins  
 Wittenberg University: Ralph Lenz  
 Wooster, College of: Gordon Collins  
 Wright State University: Donald J. Mohr, Gordon L. Wise  
 Xavier University: Anthony B. Harris, Earl J. Kronenberger  
 Youngstown State University: Lawrence E. Looby, William E. Narduzzi

## District 5

Augustana College: Virg Sandvig  
 Bradley University: Ron Ferguson, Ron Koperski  
 Buena Vista College: Darrell J. Peck  
 Central College: Ronald Schipper, Kenneth J. Weller  
 Central Missouri State University: Jerry Hughes, Alan Molde, Ginny  
 Sutton, Floyd A. Walker  
 Colorado, University of: William H. Baughn, Edwin B. Crowder  
 Cornell College: Jerry Clark  
 Creighton University: James R. Doyle, Mary Higgins, Dan Offenburger  
 Drake University: James A. Adams, Robert D. Karnes, Betty Miles,  
 Wilbur C. Miller  
 Grinnell College: John A. Pfitsch  
 Illinois State University: Art Adams, Linda Herman, H. Twyman  
 Jones, Donald G. Kelley, Donna Taylor  
 Indiana State University, Terre Haute: Alpha Cleary, Bernard F.  
 Cooper, Jerry Huntsman, John C. Jessell, Mildred Lemen  
 Iowa State University: John P. Mahlstede, Louis G. McCullough, Max  
 Urlick  
 Kansas, University of: Del Brinkman, Phyllis Howlett  
 Kansas State University: Craig Helwig, John Kadlec, Robert R. Snell,  
 Dick Towers  
 Lincoln University: James Frank, Zelma Frank  
 Luther College: Edsel K. Schweizer  
 Mankato State University: James R. Otto  
 Maryville College: Bill Heitholt  
 Missouri, University of, Columbia: G. Jean Cerre, Dave Hart, Jack  
 Lengyel, Henry T. Lowe, Barbara S. Uehling  
 Missouri, University of, Rolla: Billy A. Key  
 Missouri, University of, St. Louis: Marcia Dalbey, Charles Smith  
 Morningside College: Donald Protexter  
 Nebraska, University of, Lincoln: Keith Broman, Don Bryant, June B.  
 Davis, Robert S. Devaney, Martin A. Massengale  
 Nebraska, University of, Omaha: Connie Claussen, Don Leahy, Larry  
 Trussell, Del D. Weber  
 Nebraska Wesleyan University: Arthur C. Nicolai  
 New Mexico State University: Keith Colson, Karen Fey, Del Wells  
 North Dakota, University of: Carl R. Miller, George W. Schubert,  
 Helen Smiley

North Dakota State University: Lynn Dorn, David Forbes, Ade L. Sponberg  
 Northern Colorado, University of: Donald Chaloupka, Rosemary Fri, Joe Lindahl, Robert Montgomery  
 Northern Iowa, University of: John Jermier  
 Northwest Missouri State University: John Paul Mees  
 Oklahoma, University of: Daniel G. Gibbens, R. Gerald Turner, Wade H. Walker  
 Oklahoma City University: Arnold Short  
 Oklahoma State University: Raymond E. Chapel, Susan S. Hall, Richard A. Young  
 Oral Roberts University: Robert T. Brooks  
 St. Louis University: Guy R. Banville, Mickey Englett  
 Simpson College: Gordon Jeppson  
 South Dakota, University of: Charles D. Lein, Bobby Thompson, Mary M. Zimmerman  
 South Dakota State University: Harry L. Forsyth, Mylo A. Hellickson  
 Southeast Missouri State University: John E. Koenig, Marvin Rosengarten  
 Southern Illinois University, Carbondale: Lew Hartzog, W. D. Klimstra, Charlotte West  
 Southwest Missouri State University: Ken Brown, Duane Meyer, Aldo A. Sebben, Mary Jo Wynn  
 Tulsa, University of: John Cooper, Bradley E. Place  
 Washington University: John Schael  
 West Texas State University: Myron H. Dees, Leon Trekel  
 Wichita State University: Ted C. Bredehoft, Kim Moses, Martin M. Perlne

#### District 6

Abilene Christian University: Wally Bullington  
 Alcorn State University: Marino H. Casem, Norris A. Edney, Walter Washington  
 Angelo State University: Jane Davis, Phil George  
 Arkansas, University of, Fayetteville: J. Frank Broyles, Ruth Cohoon, Fred J. Vescolani, Albert M. Witte  
 Arkansas, University of, Little Rock: Happy Mahfouz, G. Robert Ross  
 Arkansas State University: Sam R. Gennuso, Larry Laceywell, Kay Woodiel  
 Baylor University: Edwin P. Horner, Bill Menefee  
 Bishop College: James L. Jones  
 Centenary College: Mike Carroll, Walter Stevens, David Thomas  
 Grambling State University: John A. Duplantier, Edward G. Robinson  
 Hardin-Simmons University: Jesse C. Fletcher, Jim Hatfield  
 Houston, University of: Dolores Copeland, Cedric W. Dempsey, Thomas J. Ford, Michael T. Johnson, John Kasser, Patricia Younger  
 Houston Baptist University: Ed S. Billings, Stephen Donohue, William H. Hinton  
 Jackson State University: Walter Reed, William Rush  
 Lamar University: H. Ed Eveland, Harry Gilligan, James B. Higgins, C. Robert Kemble

Louisiana Tech University: Charles W. Bussey Jr., Sonja Hogg, Harold J. Smolinski, F. Jay Taylor  
 McNeese State University: Jack V. Doland, Joseph E. Duplechin, Charles W. Sparks  
 Mississippi Valley State University: Davis Weathersby  
 North Texas State University: JoAnn Calhoun, William A. Miller, Frederick R. Pole, Bob Tyler  
 Northeast Louisiana University: Benny Hollis, Dwight D. Vines  
 Northwestern State University: A. L. Williams Jr.  
 Pan American University: Lew Comer, John W. Hook, Miguel A. Nevarez, Bill White  
 Prairie View A&M University: Marion Henry  
 Rice University: James A. Castaneda, Alan J. Chapman, August Erfurth Jr., Martha E. Hawthorne  
 Sam Houston State University: E. Rex Isham  
 Southern Methodist University: Barbara Camp, Bob Hitch, Joseph B. Tyson  
 Southern University, Baton Rouge: Jesse N. Stone Jr.  
 Southwest Texas State University: Gordon McCullough, Billy M. Miller, Allan Watson  
 Southwestern Louisiana, University of: Ray P. Authement, Dan Roy Jr., Gerard St. Martin  
 Stephen F. Austin State University: Jim Hess, Baker Pattillo  
 Texas, University of, Arlington: Wendell H. Nedderman, William E. Reeves  
 Texas, University of, Austin: Ronald M. Brown, Jerry D. Cain, DeLoss Dodds, Donna Lopiano, Glenn Maloney, L. O. Morgan, W. O. Shultz II  
 Texas, University of, San Antonio: Rudy Davalos, Daniel O. Hogenauer  
 Texas A&I University: Bill J. Franklin, Gilbert Steinke  
 Texas A&M University: Kay Don, Wally Goff, Charles H. Samson, Frank E. Vandiver  
 Texas Christian University: Carolyn Dixon, Kenneth W. Herrick, Mel Thomas, Frank Windeger  
 Texas Southern University: Dave Bethany, Willie Davis  
 Texas Tech University: John F. Conley, Jeannine McHaney, Robert M. Sweazy  
 Trinity University: Robert V. Hockey

#### District 7

Boise State University: Gene Bleymaier, Norman F. Dahm, Michael E. Mullally  
 Brigham Young University: Clayne R. Jensen, Glen C. Tuckett  
 Colorado College: Gerald C. Carle  
 Colorado School of Mines: R. Bruce Allison, John A. Hogan  
 Colorado State University: Thurman F. McGraw, Nancy J. O'Connor, Harry E. Troxell  
 Denver, University of: Ronald J. Oyer, Terrence J. Toy, Diane T. Wendt  
 Eastern Montana College: Elwood B. Hahn

Gonzaga University: Robert C. Branch, Dan Fitzgerald  
Hawaii, University of: Ted Livingston, Ray Nagel  
Idaho, University of: William S. Belknap, W. Hal Godwin  
Idaho State University: Italo J. Caccia, Darold H. Chambers  
Montana, University of: Evan Denney, Barbara B. Hollmann, Harley W. Lewis  
Montana State University: Edward L. Hanson, Tom Parac  
Nevada, University of, Las Vegas: Charles A. Bucher, Leonard E. Goodall, Christina L. Kunzer, Bradley L. Rothermel  
Nevada, University of, Reno: Richard M. Trachok, William P. Wallace  
New Mexico, University of: John D. Bridgers, Linda K. Estes, Marvin D. Johnson  
Northern Arizona, University of: T. H. Anderson, Eugene M. Hughes, Sam F. McClanahan  
Regis College: Christopher Dittman  
San Diego State University: J. Gene Bourdet, Mary Alice Hill, Jim G. Malik  
Southern Colorado, University of: Robert Mullen  
Texas, University of, El Paso: Richard W. Burns, Ed Swartz  
U.S. Air Force Academy: Col. John J. Clune, Col. Don L. Peterson, Col. Harvey Schiller  
Utah, University of: C. Arnold Ferrin Jr., R. J. Snow  
Weber State College: Gary T. Crompton, Dean W. Hurst, W. Blair Low  
Wyoming, University of: Mary Ellen Cloninger, Gary Cunningham, Joseph R. Geraud, Jack Taylor, Bill Young

#### District 8

Alaska, University of, Anchorage: David L. Outcalt, Gene A. Templeton  
Alaska, University of, Fairbanks: John C. Gilmore, Karen J. Morris  
Arizona, University of: Robert Bockrath, Mary Roby, Robert W. Sankey, David H. Strack  
Arizona State University: Pat Kuehner, Mona Plummer, Milton R. Schroeder, Richard P. Tamburo  
Bakersfield, California State College: Rudy Carvajal, George B. Hibbard, Joe Julian  
California, University of, Berkeley: Luella J. Lilly, David L. Maggard, Robert F. Steidel Jr.  
California, University of, Davis: Hubert Heitman Jr., Joe L. Singleton  
California, University of, Irvine: Linda B. Dempsay, Tim Tift  
California, University of, Los Angeles: Lynn Eilefson, Robert A. Fischer, Douglas S. Hobbs, Judith R. Holland, E. V. Svenson  
California, University of, Riverside: Franklin A. Lindeburg, James J. Sims  
California, University of, San Diego: Judith M. Sweet  
California, University of, Santa Barbara: Kenneth E. Droscher  
California Institute of Technology: Warren G. Emery  
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo: Richard Heaton  
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona: Jack B. Frost, Howard Hohman, Karen Miller  
Chapman College: Walter Bowman, Jack R. Duddy

Claremont-Mudd-Scripps Colleges: William B. Arce  
Dominguez Hills, California State University: Sue Carberry, Robert A. Pestolesi  
Eastern Washington University: Ron Raver  
Fresno, California State University: Allen Agnew, D. W. Holmes, Diane Milutinovich, F. Russell Sloan  
Fullerton, California State University: Ed Carroll, Leanne Grotke, Frank Marini, Patrick A. Wegner  
Hayward, California State University: Judith L. Hirsch  
Long Beach, California State University: Frank Bowman, Stephen Horn, Perry C. Moore, Frances M. Schaafsma  
Los Angeles, California State University: Marge Callahan, John A. Dahl, Walter G. Williamson  
Loyola Marymount University: Robert D. Arias  
Northridge, California State University: Muriel Bower, Judith M. Brame, Robert J. Hiegert, James Sefton  
Occidental College: Lynn M. Pacala  
Oregon, University of: Rick Bay, Chapin Clark, Chris Voelz  
Oregon State University: John R. Davis  
Pacific, University of the: Elkin Isaac, Stanley Volbrecht  
Pepperdine University: Wayne Wright  
Pomona-Pitzer Colleges: Edward W. Malan  
Portland, University of: Joseph A. Etzel  
Portland State University: Robert L. Casteel  
Puget Sound, University of: Jack A. Ecklund  
Sacramento, California State University: Robert T. Olmstead Jr., Irene Shea  
St. Mary's College: Donald J. McKillip  
San Diego, University of: Rev. Patrick Cahill  
San Francisco, University of: Bill Fusco, Sandee L. Hill  
San Francisco State University: William E. Partlow  
San Jose State University: David H. Adams, Gail Fullerton, Joyce Malone, Richard I. Post  
Santa Clara, University of: Marygrace Colby, George P. Malley  
Seattle Pacific University: Wesley Lingren, Keith R. Phillips  
Sonoma State University: Ralph Barkey  
Southern California, University of: Barbara A. Hedges, Clarke Howatt, Richard H. Perry  
Stanford University: Jack Friedenthal, Ferdinand A. Geiger, Pamela Strathairn  
Stanislaus, California State College: Douglas R. Sanderson  
Utah State University: Ladell Andersen, E. Kaye Hart, Norman B. Jones  
Washington, University of: Harry M. Cross, Milo R. Lude  
Washington State University: Edward M. Bennett, Sam Jankovich  
Whittier College: David A. Jacobs

#### Associate Members

Chaminade University: Mike Vasconcellos  
Nazareth College (N.Y.): William H. Carey



### Allied Members

Atlantic Coast Conference: Robert C. James  
 Big East Conference: David R. Gavitt  
 Big Eight Conference: Carl C. James, Prentice Gautt  
 Big Sky Conference: Ron Stephenson  
 Big Ten Conference: Wayne Duke, John D. Dewey, Charles D. Henry  
 California Collegiate Athletic Association: Tom D. Morgan  
 Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Bob Moorman  
 College Athletic Conference: Walter Bryant  
 \*College Football Association: Charles M. Neinas  
 East Coast Conference: Ernest C. Casale  
 Eastern Athletic Association: Leland E. Byrd  
 Eastern College Athletic Conference: Robert M. Whitelaw, George R. Bisacca, Clayton W. Chapman  
 Far Western Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Ervin C. Delman  
 Great Lakes Valley Conference: Louis Stout  
 Gulf South Conference: James L. McCullough  
 Heartland Collegiate Conference: John J. Hinga  
 Independent College Athletic Conference: Robert C. Deming  
 Ivy League: James M. Litvack  
 Lone Star Conference: Hal Lane  
 Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference: F. Paul Bogan  
 Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference: Jim McDermott  
 Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference: Lawrence K. Albus,  
 David Axelson, Jerry Lovelace  
 Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Albert L. Deal  
 Mid-American Athletic Conference: Fred Jacoby  
 \*Mid-Continent Athletic Conference: F. L. Ferzacca  
 Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference: Kenneth A. Free  
 Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference: David B. Evenson  
 Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference: Ronald D. Roberts  
 Midwestern City Conference: Cecil N. Coleman  
 Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Ken B. Jones  
 Missouri Valley Conference: Richard D. Martin  
 New Jersey State College Athletic Conference: William P. Dioguardi  
 North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: R. D. Halford  
 Northeast-8 Conference: Al Shields  
 Northern California Athletic Conference: Luella J. Lilly  
 Ohio Athletic Conference: Fred Jacoby  
 Ohio Valley Conference: James E. Delany  
 Pacific Coast Athletic Association: Lewis A. Cryer  
 Pacific-10 Conference: Wiles Hallock, David Price  
 Southeastern Conference: H. Boyd McWhorter, Robert M. Barrett,  
 Mark Womack  
 Southern Conference: Kenneth G. Germann  
 Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: George H. Hobson,  
 James E. Hawkins  
 Southland Conference: Dick Oliver, Don Graham

\*Nonvoting

Southwest Athletic Conference: Cliff Speegle, Harold W. Lahar, Bill Morgan  
 Southwestern Athletic Conference: Norris A. Edney, Richard A. Hill  
 State University of New York Athletic Conference: Robert D. Kreidler  
 Sun Belt Conference: Victor A. Bubas  
 Sunshine State Conference: Norman D. Kaye  
 Trans America Athletic Conference: Bob Vanatta  
 West Coast Athletic Conference: G. B. Wyness  
 Western Athletic Conference: Joseph L. Kearney  
 Western Collegiate Athletic Association: M. Keir Sinclair

### Affiliated Members

Athletes In Action International: Barbara Bernlohr  
 College Swimming Coaches Association of America: Corey Van Fleet  
 Major Independents Collegiate Athletic Association: Emil Narick  
 Music City Officials Association: John C. Martin  
 National Association of Basketball Coaches: Joseph R. Vancisin  
 National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics: Michael J. Cleary  
 National Fencing Coaches Association of America: Al Peredo  
 National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame: Richard W. Kazmaier Jr., James McDowell  
 National Gymnastics Judges Association Inc.: Les Sasvary  
 NCAA Division I Track Coaches Association: Dean Hayes  
 NCAA Division III Track Coaches Association: Jay Flanagan, John C. Martin  
 State of Louisiana Board of Trustees: Cornel Martin, Irwin A. Sibille

### Visitors

Amateur Basketball Association of the USA: William L. Wall  
 American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers: Al Papik  
 American Association of State Colleges and Universities: Richard Novak  
 American Council on Education: Robert H. Atwell, R. Claire Guthrie  
 Bethel College: George Henry  
 CFL Fundraising: Alois Blackwell  
 Center for Athletes Rights and Education: Allen L. Sack  
 Cotton Bowl Athletic Association: Jim Brock, John Scovell  
 Davis and Elkins College: Edward McFarlane, Guy Sievert  
 Fiesta Bowl: Bruce Skinner  
 Garden State Bowl: Loris Smith, Leslie H. Unger  
 Gator Bowl: George R. Olsen  
 Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: H. D. Peterson  
 Hall of Fame Bowl: Bob Lochamy  
 Holiday Bowl: John Reid  
 Jacka, William M.; Birmingham, Alabama  
 Joint Commission on Competitive Safeguards: William E. Newell  
 McNaughton, Charlotte; Washington, D.C.  
 National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges: Sue Frarkin

National Gymnastics Association: Hutch Dvorak  
 National Invitation Tournament: Peter Carlesimo  
 Orange Bowl: Lee Hutcheson, Dan McNamara, William D. Ward  
 Pasadena Tournament of Roses Association: Robert Cheney, Millard Davidson, Stanley Hahn, Thornton Hamlin, William Nicholas, Fred Soldwedel, Arthur Welsh

Point Loma College: Glenda Holt, Carroll Lond  
 Sicavision Communications: Joe Sica  
 Sports Media Productions: Joe Gallagher  
 Sugar Bowl: Mickey Holmes, Mike Smith  
 Sun Bowl: John Folmer, Sam Jenkins, Tom Starr  
 Tangerine Bowl: Charles McClendon  
 U.S. Tennis Association: Jim Colclough  
 Universities Athletic Union: Alon Evans  
 Vingoe, Ian R.; Melrose, Massachusetts

#### Working News Media

ABC Sports: Donn Bernstein  
 Alabama, University of: Charley Thornton  
 Arkansas Democrat: Wally Hall  
 Associated Press, Kansas City: Doug Tucker  
 Associated Press, New York: Hershel Nissenson  
 Austin American Statesman: Mike Hurd  
 Beaumont Enterprise: Dave Rogers  
 Birmingham News: Alf Van Hoose  
 Bradley Photography: Jim Bradley  
 CBS Radio: Dick Brescia, Frank Miller  
 CBS Sports: Beano Cook, Len DeLuca, Carl Lindemann, Donn O'Brien, Kevin O'Malley, Neil Pilson  
 Chronicle of Higher Education: Lorenzo Middleton  
 Daily Oklahoman: Jerry McConnell  
 Dallas Morning News: Barry Horn  
 Dallas Times-Herald: Bob Galt  
 Evans, Wilbur  
 Fort Worth Star-Telegram: Jim Carley  
 Higher Education Daily: Scott Vance  
 Houston Chronicle: Eddie Sefko, Jerry Wizig  
 Houston Post: Tommy Bonk, Tracy Dodds, Jack Gallagher  
 KAKE-TV: Frank Bruce, Randy Westman  
 KENR Radio: John Greer, Mark Seegers  
 KILT Radio: Pat Hermandy  
 KMJQ Radio: Alvin Jackson  
 KMSD Radio: Vern McKee  
 KOCO-TV: Mick Cornett  
 KPRC Radio: Don Brubaker  
 KTNX-TV: Shawn Donahue, Steve Pascente  
 KTRH Radio: John Breen, David Seaton, Jerry Trupiano  
 KULF Radio: David Courtney  
 Kansas City Star: Steve Richardson  
 Las Vegas Review-Journal: Keith Tift  
 Lincoln Journal-Star: Virgil Parker  
 Los Angeles Times: Bill Shirley

Louisiana Superdome: Bill Curl  
 Memphis Commercial-Appeal: Al Dunning  
 Memphis Press Scimitar: George Lapidis  
 Mutual Broadcasting: Jack Clements, Luke Griffin  
 NBC Sports: Rex Lardner, Ken Schanzer, Steve Ulrich, Arthur Watson  
 Nashville Banner: Fred Russell  
 New York Times: Gordon White  
 Newsday: Manny Topol  
 Philadelphia Inquirer: Mel Greenberg  
 Salt Lake City Tribune: John Mooney  
 Sports Illustrated: Brooks Clark  
 Texas, University of, Austin: Jones Ramsey  
 Tiger Rag: Steve Townsend  
 Tucson Citizen: Corky Simpson  
 Tulsa World: Charlie Smith  
 United Press International: Gary Taylor  
 University of Texas Daily Texan: Eddie Perkins, Susie Woodhams

## DIVISION I ROUND TABLE

Monday, January 11, 1982

The Division I round table of the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened at 8 a.m. Monday, January 11, in the Imperial East Room of the Hyatt Regency Hotel. Joseph R. Geraud of the University of Wyoming, chair of the Division I Steering Committee, presided. Panelists for the session included the other members of the Division I Steering Committee: Francis W. Bonner, Furman University; G. Jean Cerra, University of Missouri, Columbia; John R. Davis, Oregon State University; Susan B. Feamster, University of Kentucky; Lee R. Hayley, University of Georgia; Mary Alice Hill, San Diego State University; Judith R. Holland, University of California, Los Angeles; Olav B. Kollevoll, Lafayette College; Noah N. Langdale Jr., Georgia State University; Andrew T. Mooradian, University of New Hampshire; Jackie H. Murphy, Southern University, Baton Rouge; Casimir J. Myslinski, University of Pittsburgh; Gwendolyn Norrell, Michigan State University; Sondra Norrell-Thomas, Howard University; Alvin R. Paul, Columbia University; Charles H. Samson, Texas A&M University; John W. Sawyer, Wake Forest University; Richard G. Shrider, Miami University, and Richard A. Young, Oklahoma State University.

*[NOTE: The following is a summary of the round-table discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning the proposed amendments is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]*

Prior to the discussion of agenda items, Mr. Geraud presented a series of general announcements concerning Convention publications and amendment procedures. He then reviewed the purposes of the round-table meeting. It was noted that the round-table discussion provides the opportunity for sponsors of proposed amendments to present explanations of the meaning and effect of the various amendments. In addition, the discussion may enable sponsors of a proposed amendment to ascertain whether sufficient support exists to warrant consideration of the proposal at the business session.

Another purpose of the round table is to take action upon requests for waivers of membership criteria as authorized under the legislation of the Association, and it was noted that six such waiver requests would be considered by the Division I-A Football membership at approximately 10 a.m. during the round-table session. Other agenda items for the meeting were reviewed; and Mr. Geraud introduced Wiles Hallock, commissioner of the Pacific-10 Conference, who had been requested by the steering committee to discuss legislation related to football television issues.

### Television Proposals

Prior to discussing the specific television proposals sponsored by the

NCAA Council, Mr. Hallock noted that, in light of legislation adopted at the December 1981 special Convention, the NCAA Football Television Committee had met on December 15 and 16, 1981, to set priorities for subsequent renegotiation with two of the major television networks. These priorities included the following objectives: the guaranteeing of Division I-AA institutional appearances at a rate commensurate with the rate that was approved for the 1978-81 NCAA Television Plan, the relaxation in ground rules for the proposed supplementary football series by expanding the number of teams available to the series, and the achievement of greater flexibility in the consideration of requests for exception telecasts by member institutions.

Mr. Hallock then reviewed specific legislative proposals related to football television issues. It was noted that adoption of the Council's April 17, 1981, interpretation regarding football television controls would confirm the Association's authority to implement the procedures through which governing television principles were adopted by the membership in 1981. Another proposal sponsored by the Council would establish in the constitution that the bylaws of the Association would provide for NCAA controls over all forms of football television and cablecasting; further, this proposal would specify in the bylaws that each of the three divisions may act separately on football television principles, with only football-playing members of each division to vote on such principles. It was reported that the Council would introduce a resolution in conjunction with this proposal which would provide that the necessary majority vote of Division I for approval of television principles must include a majority vote of the Division I-A institutions.

### Basketball Championship Qualifications

David R. Gavitt, chair of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee, reviewed proposed legislation related to the conduct of the Division I Men's Basketball Championship. Background information was presented to indicate the committee's concern regarding the increased number of teams participating in Division I basketball and the resultant increase in the number of conferences receiving automatic qualification for the Division I Men's Basketball Championship.

It was noted that the NCAA Executive Committee had voted that, beginning in 1983, not more than 50 percent of the positions in the bracket for the Division I Men's Basketball Championship may be allocated to champions of automatic-qualifying conferences. A spokesman for the Midwestern City Conference indicated that, in light of this action taken by the Executive Committee, the resolution sponsored by that conference concerning the automatic-qualification issue would be withdrawn. It was reported that an additional resolution related to the tournament, specifying certain requirements designed to accommodate all champions of automatic-qualifying conferences, would remain under consideration.

### Ivy League Statement

Howard R. Swearer, president of Brown University, presented a statement on behalf of Ivy League chief executive officers concerning the action taken during the December 1981 special Convention to restructure Division I. Mr. Swearer described the commitment made by

Ivy League member institutions to the development and conduct of extensive intercollegiate athletic programs. Concern was expressed regarding the role of revenue considerations in determining policy decisions affecting restructuring, and it was reported that conference members intended to work to emphasize and advance the Association's founding principles related to maintaining intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the institution's educational program.

#### Other Legislation

Mr. Geraud reviewed additional legislative proposals of interest to Division I member institutions. Among the proposals identified by the chair were amendments related to the control of property rights, bowl game invitations, part-time football coaches, the satisfactory progress rule, complimentary tickets, financial aid limitations, summer orientation programs, transfer waiver provisions and Council restructuring.

In addition, delegates discussed the application of a proposed amendment to the Association's penalty structure which would permit the Committee on Infractions or Council to impose television sanctions in sports in which live television programming is not subject to the Association's control or administration. It was noted that the primary purpose of this proposal was to enable the Committee on Infractions or the Council to impose consistent and effective penalties in infractions cases which involve a sport other than football. Application of the proposal would affect television programs involving live coverage of the institution's intercollegiate athletic teams in the sports in which the violations occurred.

#### Waiver Requests

Consideration was given by delegates representing Division I-A Football member institutions to waiver requests from Arkansas State University, Louisiana Tech University, Northeast Louisiana University, the University of Richmond, Virginia Military Institute and the College of William and Mary. Each of the institutions in question requested a waiver of the Division I-A Football criteria related to stadium size and home-game attendance. Mr. Geraud described the procedures to be followed in reviewing each institution's request and noted that an information sheet had been distributed generally at the round table to summarize the facts in each case. This material indicated the status of each institution in regard to the applicable Division I membership criteria, including the provisions of Bylaw 10-1-(e)-(3) and (4).

Representatives of each institution were given the opportunity to present additional information to supplement that set forth in the fact sheet and the correspondence that each institution already had forwarded to Division I-A member institutions. Subsequent to these presentations, the chair conducted a vote of Division I-A delegates attending the round table to determine whether the waiver requests in question would be granted. In each instance, the delegates voted to decline the institution's request for a waiver of the Division I-A membership criteria. Following the review of these appeals, the meeting was adjourned.

## DIVISION II ROUND TABLE

Monday, January 11, 1982

The Division II round table of the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened at 8:13 a.m. Monday, January 11, in the Regency Room of the Hyatt Regency Hotel. Aldo A. Sebben, Southwest Missouri State University, Division II Steering Committee chair, presided. Panelists included the other members of the Division II Steering Committee: Joan Board, Grand Valley State College; Judith M. Brame, California State University, Northridge; Howard Davis, Tuskegee Institute; Lonnie J. Davis, Northern Kentucky University; Asa N. Green, Livingston University; Chalmer G. Hixson, Wayne State University; Edwin W. Lawrence, Cheyney State College; Wayne State Piepul, American International College, and P. LaVerne Sweat, Hampton Institute.

*[NOTE: The following is a summary of the round-table discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning proposed amendments or other agenda items is summarized. Due to circumstances beyond the control of the Association, a verbatim transcript was not prepared.]*

Prior to the discussion, Mr. Sebben introduced the panel and made general announcements regarding round-table procedures and the annual Convention in general. He noted that the round table constituted the opening of the Convention for members of Division II.

At appropriate points during the presentations, parliamentary considerations were clarified and the position of the Council or the steering committee regarding certain proposals was reported.

#### Academic Requirements

In response to a question, it was reported that a preliminary interpretation regarding Proposal No. 42 was that the acceptable credit degree offered by the institution.

#### Eligibility

It was clarified that the adjustment in the division's five-year eligibility rule proposed in No. 54 would be applicable to any student-athlete at a Division II institution, regardless of whether the student was enrolled prior to adoption of No. 54.

In response to a question, it was reported that a preliminary interpretation of Proposal No. 62 would apply that legislation to a student-athlete who was not recruited by the institution from which the student was transferring, rather than not recruited by any institution.

In response to another question, a preliminary interpretation was reported to the effect that a physical examination would count as practice if athletic department personnel issued the invitation or request for the examination.



### Financial Aid

The Division II membership in attendance discussed at length Proposal Nos. 68 and 78, both of which would limit athletically related aid in Division II to tuition and fees (and, in No. 68, books). The Division II Steering Committee reported that it favored No. 68 if the membership wanted this type of aid restriction. Various speakers from the audience suggested that No. 68 might be more difficult to administer than No. 78 and urged that football and basketball be exempted from the provisions of No. 78, as they would be for Division I. It also was suggested that some members might seek to change the order of business to vote on No. 78 before No. 68.

Several questions were asked regarding those two proposals. It was clarified that a National Merit Scholarship is not institutional aid and therefore could be awarded under those provisions; further, an amendment to No. 78 to exempt Division II football and basketball would be in order. It also was emphasized that the constitutional limit on the total amount of aid a student-athlete may receive would prevail if either No. 68 or No. 78 were adopted. Several members suggested that adoption of No. 68 would require considerable interpretation to determine the types of awards that would be acceptable under that legislation.

Delta State University, one of the original sponsors of Proposal No. 68, announced that it no longer supported that amendment.

Straw votes were taken on Proposal Nos. 68 and 78. Those in attendance favored No. 78 by a 48-39 vote and opposed No. 68 by a 40-56 count.

A preliminary interpretation regarding Proposal No. 73 stated that the student-athlete's award under that legislation would not have to be reduced if the student-athlete received books as a portion of the Pell Grant inasmuch as the intent of the proposal was to permit a student-athlete to retain more of the Pell Grant than present legislation permitted.

In presenting the financial aid legislation, Mr. Green emphasized the rationale behind the proposed sport-by-sport financial aid limitations for Division II women's programs, noting the difference in emphasis between men and women in certain sports (e.g., volleyball); the need to assist institutions in meeting Title IX aid requirements, and consideration of the traditional limitations in women's sports.

John A. Hogan, Colorado School of Mines, asked why the steering committee opposed Proposal No. 81. In response, Mr. Green noted that the proposal would weaken the effect of the division's aid limitations in certain sports and could result in abuses and the need for increased interpretation of Division II financial aid legislation. Speakers from the audience argued that the proposed legislation already applied to all sports except football and basketball and that few problems had arisen. It was suggested that the equivalency procedure relates to the desirability of the proposal and that institutions are in a position of needing to use all forms of available aid in the present economy. It also was announced that the College Divisions Commissioners Association favored No. 81.

### Membership Classification

In a straw vote on Proposal No. 92, which would reduce the division's sports sponsorship requirement from six to four (including two team sports), those in attendance narrowly opposed the amendment, 48-53. Those in opposition argued that such a reduction was contrary to the Division II philosophy, while others suggested that it was necessary for some institutions in view of financial exigencies and the need to develop women's programs. Some speakers charged that some institutions want to place their financial backing in the major sports, while others argued the importance of offering as much participation as possible. In response, it was noted that the legislation dealt only with a minimum requirement and no institution would be required to discontinue sports.

It also was reported that the Division II membership, in a 1981 survey, had strongly favored a reduction in the sports sponsorship requirement, as had the Division II chief executive officers attending an NCAA-sponsored CEO meeting in September. Those expressions had prompted the steering committee to recommend the reduction.

### Television

NCAA President James Frank was asked to discuss the property rights and television issues reflected in Proposal Nos. 36, 45, 46 and 47. President Frank stated that adoption of No. 36 would threaten the existence of the NCAA inasmuch as it would eliminate any effective enforcement of most NCAA legislation. He emphasized that voluntary membership in an Association inherently carries an obligation to surrender certain things that might be considered "rights" in the interest of agreeing to abide by common rules for the common good.

Mr. Frank also clarified the implications of the television proposals and said the annual Convention was the proper forum in which the membership should decide those issues.

### Championships

Noting that Proposal No. 114 would establish an NCAA Women's Soccer Championship, one member urged that the Association make soccer a spring sport for women.

### Waivers

Mr. Sebben introduced representatives of two institutions that had petitioned for waivers of the Division II membership criteria—Davis and Elkins College and Florida Atlantic University. All delegates had received summaries of those requests, and the steering committee had voted to support both. The round table, in separate votes, approved the two petitions.

## DIVISION III ROUND TABLE

Monday, January 11, 1982

The Division III round table of the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened at 8 a.m. Monday, January 11, in the Arborium Room of the Hyatt Regency Hotel. Donald M. Russell, Wesleyan University, Division III Steering Committee chair, presided. Panelists included the other members of the Division III Steering Committee: Harriett Crannell, Millikin University; Patricia A. Thompson, Elmira College; Thomas M. Kinder, Bridgewater College; Elizabeth A. Kruczek, Fitchburg State College; Edward W. Malan, Pomona-Pitzer Colleges; William A. Marshall, Franklin and Marshall College; Mary Jean Mulvaney, University of Chicago; Edwin D. Muto, State University of New York, Buffalo; Kenneth J. Weller, Central College (Iowa); J. William Grice, Case Western Reserve University, and Robert F. Riedel, State University College, Geneseo, Division III representatives on the NCAA Executive Committee, also served as panelists.

*[NOTE: The following is a summary of the round-table discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]*

Mr. Russell introduced the panel and made general announcements, including the deadline for amendments to amendments and editorial corrections in the Convention program. He noted that a paper entitled "The Statement of Philosophy for Division III" had been distributed to the assemblage and requested the delegates' comments, explaining that the philosophy should be solidified and published within the next year to identify the division and its reasons for existence.

### General

Mr. Weller presented the history of the property rights proposal, No. 36, through the special Convention held December 3-4, 1981, in St. Louis. He explained that legal counsel's view of the term "property rights" is much broader than the issue of television and could encompass such areas as financial aid. He opined that passage of the proposal would destroy the NCAA's ability to act as a regulatory body in many of its key areas by preventing it from limiting such things as an institution's financial aid budgets or recruiting expenses. He said an attempt to amend the proposal by inserting the word "television" before the words "property rights" throughout the proposal would not lessen the threat to the regulatory powers of the Association, and he strongly recommended voting against the proposal.

### Television

In presenting Proposal Nos. 45 and 46, Mr. Weller noted that, although television contractual matters are not directly relevant to Division III, the relaxation of all television controls would seriously affect its members. He noted Proposal No. 45 is a request for ratifica-

tion of the Council's official interpretation of Bylaw 11-3-(aa), which delineates the Football Television Committee's representation and sets its responsibilities. The proposal affirms the practices of the television committees for the past 30 years and subjects future televising and cablecasting of football games to the terms of the NCAA Football Television Plan in effect each year. Proposal No. 46 validates all actions taken with respect to the football television program for 1982-1985 and avoids basing their legality on inference.

Mr. Malan presented Proposal No. 47, noting the steering committee's belief that the television controls of the Association have benefited Division III and have served the entire Association well. After explaining the proposal thoroughly, he asked Ronald M. Schipper, Central College (Iowa), the Division III representative to the Football Television Committee, to add his comments and respond to questions from the floor.

Mr. Schipper reiterated that the removal of controls from televising college football would have an enormous effect on Division III institutions. He praised the Football Television Committee for its genuine interest in Divisions II and III football and urged Division III participation in the passage of the legislation. Mr. Weller noted that Proposal No. 47 was written to retain the right of modification each year; but, if the proposal were to fail and no television plan were authorized, the Association would lose any possibility of future control of football television. Mr. Russell added that approximately 20 percent of NCAA functions are funded by football television receipts. Gordon Collins, College of Wooster, pointed to the proliferation of college basketball games on network and cable television due to lack of regulation and its negative impact on game attendance and, therefore, revenues.

### Eligibility

Mr. Malan noted that Proposal No. 54 would make the five-year rule flexible for the first time by counting toward the five-year eligibility limit only the semesters of actual residency at an institution, rather than counting chronologically from the date of first enrollment.

### Dues

Mr. Riedel, a Division III representative to the Executive Committee, presented Proposal No. 83 on dues increases, noting first that the Council would sponsor an amendment to delete the second paragraph so that all future dues increases would be brought before the membership. He referred to the work and negotiation between Council members and the Division III representatives to create the proposal as it stood and noted the philosophical change by the Executive Committee in relating the dues structure directly to the benefits received by member institutions. He gave an accounting of costs based on a ratio of two (Division I) to one (Division II) to one (Division III) as used by the Council for the structuring of most NCAA committees and stated that dues represent less than one percent of the operating budget of the Association. There were no comments from the floor.

### Division III Criteria

In presenting Proposal Nos. 94 and 95, Ronald D. Roberts, Lawrence

University, stated that size of enrollment is used widely as a basis for delineation, referring to the organizational structure of state high school associations, and that size is significant both in recruiting and competition if grants-in-aid are not a consideration. He stated that 211 institutions meet the proposed criterion of 3,500 or below enrollment. Mr. Roberts expressed concern that Division I institutions might follow the football concept and propose that other sports in a Division I program be classified in Divisions II or III. It was his opinion that the cost of adding championships for an additional division would not be significant.

Statements from the floor in favor of the proposals emphasized the inequity of institutions of 15,000 enrollment competing with those of 700 enrollment, the potential loss of member institutions that are paying their "fair share" in dues but feel they are being denied championship opportunities because of competing against larger athletic programs, the inequity of Division I institutions competing in a Division III philosophical context and a desire for a means to prevent that competition. Arguments against the proposals included the statistically demonstrated failure of large institutions to dominate the championships; the unifying athletic philosophy and approach of all Division III institutions, regardless of size; the small percentage of students actually living on campus at some of the larger institutions; the fact that scheduling can be done with schools of compatible size; the historical support of the principle of institutional autonomy and self-determination, and concern for the disfranchisement of the 66 institutions that exceed the 3,500 limit of the proposal.

Mr. Riedel stated there were not additional moneys to provide championships for a Division III-A and noted that the presidents who attended the chief executive officers' meeting in September overwhelmingly supported philosophy as the underlying basis for membership in Division III rather than enrollment.

At that point in the discussion, a speaker stated that Proposal No. 94 was being withdrawn; and that was confirmed by Mr. Russell.

A straw vote indicated the assembly opposed Proposal No. 95. Mr. Russell concluded that the consensus appeared to be that enrollment was not the best method by which to address the problems and concerns presented.

### Championships

Mr. Grice, as a member of the Championship Standards Subcommittee of the Executive Committee, presented Proposal No. 110, which would limit Division I championships to Division I institution athletes. The subcommittee's recommendation to the Executive Committee was based on the negative psychological effects of a Division III athlete's winning a national championship and immediately losing in Division I competition, the expense to the institution of sending a coach and athlete to an additional national championship and, finally, the irritant to Division I of Division III athletes failing to occupy those positions allocated for them at a Division I championship. Mr. Grice indicated, however, that he had received many letters from wrestlers deploring the concept of terminal championships, which had led in part to the compromise in Proposal No. 112.

Charles L. Crawford, State University College, Brockport, commented on the loss of the additional opportunities for the athlete and the negative impact the loss of that opportunity would have on recruiting. Many speakers favored Proposal No. 112 as a compromise. Mr. Riedel noted that many Division I personnel feel championship opportunities are denied their athletes by accommodation of Divisions II and III athletes who already have had the experience of national competition. A straw vote resulted in 77 votes for and 72 votes against Proposal No. 110.

In requesting a straw vote for Proposal No. 112, Mr. Russell reminded the participants that the proposal would reduce the number of Division III competitors allowed to compete in Division I championships except in the sports of gymnastics and wrestling, which would remain the same. The vote was substantially in favor of No. 112.

Noting that the opportunity to vote on Proposal No. 112 might not occur if Proposal No. 110 were defeated, Douglas R. Sanderson, California State College, Stanislaus, asked for a straw vote from Division III members on the reordering of those proposals so that No. 112 would be considered first. Mr. Russell explained that the order could be changed by a majority vote of the whole Convention. In a vote to ascertain the wishes of the Division III members regarding reordering the proposals, the votes were approximately even. In answer to a question, Mr. Russell stated that those institutions sponsoring Proposal No. 112 had been asked to do so by the Division III Steering Committee, which had drafted the compromise proposal in response to requests by the wrestling coaches.

### Membership Classification

Ms. Mulvaney presented Proposal No. 85, which would except women's basketball from the list of sports in which Division III members can petition for Division I classification. The straw vote taken indicated the majority in favor of Proposal No. 85.

Ms. Mulvaney presented Proposal No. 86, a resolution ordering the Classification Committee to poll the membership as to its desire for multidivisional classification and, if the results so indicated, to order the Council to propose appropriate legislation for the next Convention. Don Harnum, Susquehanna University, noted that the administration of financial aid to a multisport athlete in a multidivisional classification would be extraordinarily difficult. Joanne A. Fortunato, Keene State College, noted that the resolution mandates only a search of the membership's desires. Mr. Russell stated that the Council was opposed to the resolution because it felt the issues had been addressed thoroughly in the recent past by the Governance Committee.

Ms. Mulvaney presented Proposal No. 87, after which Mr. Russell proposed a straw vote to ascertain the wishes of the participants on limiting Division III institutions to Division III championships. Gerald C. Carle, Colorado College, spoke against such limitations, saying some institutions would be forced to move their entire sports programs to Division II to enable them to compete in Division I, when the programs would actually remain Division III. It was noted there were approximately 18 institutions in upper divisions that opt to play football in



### Division III.

Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego, remarked that skiing, water polo and volleyball are open championships and, therefore, would not be affected by divisional membership status. Charles L. Crawford, State University College, Brockport, noted that the Division III philosophy has enabled a number of institutions to move club football to a Division III level and that legislation against the few who might dominate by dropping down might greatly limit the opportunities for college students to play football. A straw vote directed the Division III Steering Committee to pursue the matter of limiting divisional competition to Division III member institutions.

#### Recruiting

Ms. Thompson presented Proposal Nos. 96 and 97, which would permit tryouts for prospective student-athletes under limited circumstances, noting that the proposals were created to reduce recruiting costs and to try to bring the successful audition program from the women's intercollegiate arena to the men's. Steering committee concerns centered around the possibility of injury during tryouts, insurance liability, added pressure on the prospective athlete and the damage to the prospective athlete's high school eligibility as prescribed by state high school regulations. Proponents of the proposals pointed out that this would provide the many Division III schools who have only part-time coaches an opportunity to assess athletes' expertise and would provide an opportunity for the high school student to enjoy experiences with college students on campus and to participate in campus activities.

Critics of the proposals noted that the excepted sports of football, wrestling, ice hockey and lacrosse are those on which colleges spend most of their recruiting money, and that the proposals are departures from the Division III educational philosophy of athletics and would proliferate recruiting abuses and violations in all divisions. On-campus tryouts would not replace off-campus recruiting contact, they asserted, and violations of the tryouts restrictions would be extremely difficult to police.

Mr. Malan noted that the proposals were initiated by women athletic administrators as a continuation of their way of recruiting and, further, they felt those methods might be a potential economy move for men. Mr. Russell noted that the proposals were favored by the Council by a small majority. The straw vote was substantially against the proposals.

#### Governance

Ms. Kruczek presented Proposal Nos. 119 and 120 which concern the restructuring of the NCAA Council, explaining that No. 119 was submitted before the special Convention in December and that it did not adequately address the implementation of the newly approved legislation concerning football classification. She explained that No. 120 hinged on the prior passage of Proposal No. 84 (creation of Division IV) and that, if No. 84 were not approved, No. 120 would be moot. She noted that the Council urged defeat of No. 119 to provide adequate time to formulate a restructuring plan that would address all interests. Mr. Russell added that both the Division III Steering Committee and the

representatives on the Council urged defeat of No. 119.

#### Transfer Rules

Mr. Muto presented Proposal Nos. 64 and 65, which would liberalize the junior college transfer rules for Division III only. He also presented Proposal Nos. 66 and 67. Speakers on those proposals indicated opposition to immediate eligibility at any institution without restriction. Mr. Marshall emphasized the need for relief for a young person who has legitimate reasons for a transfer.

#### Championships (Continued)

Mr. Marshall presented points for and against Proposal No. 117, a resolution directing the Executive Committee to assure positions in the 1983 Division I Men's Basketball Championships to all automatic-qualifying conferences.

Eugene H. Haas, Gettysburg College, spoke against Proposal No. 116, which would limit the governing sports committee to selection of the conference champion for national championship play prior to consideration of any other member of that conference. He noted that the Division III Football Committee had been constrained in its choices by the men's equivalent of that proposal approved at the last Convention.

#### Other Business

Mr. Russell gave a brief report on the chief executive officers' meeting held in September 1981. Approximately 100 Division III institutions were represented by the 15 chief executive officers, 14 of whom represented conferences. The presidents met with members of the Council and some members of the steering committee to discuss enrollment issues, financial aid interpretations, Division III philosophy and the operations of the NCAA. Responding to a questionnaire sent later by the NCAA staff, the attending presidents indicated that they thought the meetings were well worthwhile and should be continued. Mr. Russell then requested names of chief executive officers interested in attending the 1982 meeting in September.

Robert C. Deming, Ithaca College, a Division III representative on the Nominating Committee, requested nominations of candidates for Council positions from selected districts.

#### Continuing Discussion

In response to a question on financial aid, Mr. Russell indicated that an interpretation would be published in the NCAA News within the next two months.

In response to a question on Proposal No. 26, which would abolish the International Relations Committee, Thomas C. Hansen of the NCAA staff stated that the NCAA was well represented in several international federations. The Council believes that it is more functional for the NCAA to work through those persons rather than to have a general committee that would not necessarily include those representatives, he said. Mr. Deming, Ithaca College, spoke against the abolition of that committee, saying he felt the membership had not been advised adequately when the NCAA dropped membership in the United States Collegiate Sports Council and the Olympic Committee. He asked that the NCAA be encouraged to be more active internationally because its

member institutions are a major source of athletes for a number of the competitions.

Mr. Riedel reported on business conducted in the Executive Committee the previous day, noting that the committee adopted a proposal from the Division I Men's Basketball Committee that should generate an additional \$800,000 for the Association. The basketball committee had asked that the funds be earmarked to help championships in other areas; however, the Executive Committee had declined the request. Following Mr. Riedel's presentation, the meeting adjourned.

## HONORS LUNCHEON

**Monday, January 11, 1982**

The 17th annual honors luncheon was held in the Imperial Ballroom of the Hyatt Regency Hotel, NCAA President James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri), presiding.

**President Frank:** It is my pleasure to welcome you to the 17th annual honors luncheon. Please rise for the invocation, which will be given by Arliss L. Roaden, president of Tennessee Technological University.

**Arliss L. Roaden** (Tennessee Technological University): Let us pray. God, our Father, ruler of the universe, we have so much for which to be thankful, the food which you give us, health, happiness, friends and colleagues; the opportunity to assemble, to deliberate on the matters before us, and to honor those who bring honor to all of us through their qualities of excellence. For these and all your bountiful blessings, we thank you, and especially now we pray for your blessings on this assembly. Guide us in our deliberations. May our actions bring honor to your name. Your glory is manifested through the exemplary qualities of those who you honor today. May your blessings continue with them all the days of their lives and may yours be the glory forever and ever. Amen.

**President Frank:** I am pleased to welcome each of you to this occasion. The honors luncheon has become a highlight of the annual Convention; and we are exceedingly happy to have this opportunity to recognize current and former student-athletes, and their institutions, who have made significant contributions to our society for the betterment of mankind.

Intercollegiate athletics provide a common bond for each of us attending this luncheon. From my lifelong involvement and association with sports, I strongly believe that, as presidents, faculty representatives, athletic directors, other administrators and coaches, we derive positive values from our association with collegiate sports, which enable us to handle complex issues within this Association in an objective and systematic manner. Many of our discussions are highly competitive, and they should be; but we accept the decisions we make as delegates in the best interest of intercollegiate athletics.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to share this day with a truly outstanding assemblage of individuals. Many of us have been touched personally by those who will be honored today, and we are richer because we have had the privilege to know or observe them.

This luncheon provides the NCAA an appropriate forum to accentuate the positive side of intercollegiate athletics. The individuals we honor today are emblematic of the success student-athletes achieve on campus and in their chosen professions after graduation.

All of us can take great pride in the accomplishments of our honorees. The success they have enjoyed provides positive examples for those student-athletes who will follow in their footsteps and reaffirms our commitment to the continued improvement and development of sound intercollegiate athletic programs. The heights to which these individuals have ascended clearly demonstrates the necessity of this nation's continuing to provide quality competitive sports programs for our men and women students. You truly deserve the honors that will be bestowed upon you today.

In giving recognition to the honorees, being cognizant of the significance of this honors luncheon, and in thinking about our agenda for the Convention and the decisions to be made over the next couple of days, I am reminded of what R. H. Royle said about sport in his book, "Sport—Mirror of American Life." He wrote, "Sport permeates any number of levels of contemporary society; and it touches upon and deeply influences such disparate elements as status, race relations, business life, automotive design, clothing styles, the concept of the hero, language and ethical values. For better or worse, it gives form and substance to much in American life."

Before I turn the program over to our master of ceremonies, I wish to make a few special introductions of individuals seated at the head table. First, the institutional representative for the NCAA Award of Valor honoree, Neale R. Stoner, director of athletics at the University of Illinois.

It is an understatement to report this has been an extremely active and interesting two years for the officers of the Association. As chair of the Special Committee on Legislative Review and secretary-treasurer, John Toner has worked diligently in attempting to meet the needs of all NCAA constituents and has devoted countless hours helping the Association stay abreast of and meet the needs of our membership. It is my pleasure to present to you the director of athletics at the University of Connecticut and secretary-treasurer, John Toner.

It is also an understatement to say that, for any organization to be successful, it needs a prime mover who is knowledgeable, courageous and dedicated. The NCAA is indeed fortunate to have as its executive director a man who possesses these qualities and who has contributed immeasurably toward making the NCAA the great organization that it is today. It is my pleasure to present the executive director of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, Walter Byers.

Now, I take special pleasure in presenting our master of ceremonies to you. I trust this trip to Houston has permitted him and his wife to enjoy a "homecoming," since this is the city in which he began his unparalleled career in broadcast journalism.

He actually entered the field of journalism worrying about printing presses rather than satellite transmissions. He first was a campus correspondent for the Houston Post while he attended the University of Texas and subsequently became general assignment editor at the Houston Press.

He had a brief stint as a sports announcer for an Oklahoma City radio station before beginning an 11-year association with United Press. His

byline received world-wide recognition, especially from Americans at home yearning for information from this World War II correspondent who covered the major battles and actually landed with allied troops on more than one occasion.

Following the surrender of Germany, he reestablished United Press bureaus in Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg, where he was the chief correspondent at the Nuremberg trials and then Moscow. He then spent two years broadcasting events in Washington for a group of midwestern radio stations before joining CBS News in 1950.

His tenure as anchorman and managing editor of the CBS Evening News needs no amplification. He literally covered every major news event in the universe, became a world-renowned authority on America's space program and received numerous awards, including three Emmys, for his newscasts and special reports. Last January, he was presented the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

In 1966, Time magazine simply described him as "the single most convincing and authoritative figure in television news." He also was the only journalist to be voted among the top 10 "most influential decision makers in America," in leadership surveys conducted by U.S. News and World Report among a cross section of American leaders, who also selected him as "the most influential person" in the field of broadcasting five separate years.

A former president of the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, he is a member of the University of Texas School of Journalism Advisory Board. He continues to receive special assignments from CBS News and is the host of Walter Cronkite's Universe.

Ladies and gentlemen, join me in welcoming Walter Cronkite.

**Walter Cronkite:** Thank you very much for that very warm reception. Thank you, President Frank.

I think I need to explain that business of being voted the most trusted man in America. For one thing, I don't trust polls. Another thing, they clearly didn't know I started out life as a sports announcer. (Laughter)

I don't want to denigrate the great profession of sports announcing. I don't think there is any form of reporting in the world that requires the same sort of accuracy as required of the announcers on television who are describing for a knowledgeable audience the very things they are seeing for themselves on the screen. (Laughter)

On the other hand, back in the dim, dark days when we didn't have television, we had a wonderful medium called radio as our sole source of information; and it is a magnificent one, of course. Well, actually I started out life much like Ronald Reagan did. (Laughter) I did reconstruct the play-by-play from Western Union telegraph reports.

The little man sitting there with the head set listening to the clatter of a Morse button and typing on a silent typewriter, over whose shoulder I read the code words, the name of the man carrying the ball, the position he tried to go through, the run or the pass and the man who made the tackle, how many yards were made. That is all the information we had.

From that, of course, you reconstructed a dramatic report of the

day's game. They are out of the huddle, Jeff somebody is back, he fakes back, he is going right through the line and through the right tackle. Oops, he has slipped, it looks like he is down. I can't tell. There is a big pile. There is a big pile there. It looks like he made about—no, it is about a half yard. He made about a half yard. (Laughter)

Well, this all goes very well until the moment of disaster. The worst was the UCLA-Notre Dame game and the wire went down between California and Kansas City, Missouri, where I was doing this bit for a little station that made WKRP in Cincinnati look like a giant. (Laughter) The wire goes down. I assume it is only going to be down for 60 seconds or something, and it can't be long, really, so I have a time out to take care of that matter.

We listened to a little band music. I come up in a minute and the game is still not there. Well, that was the longest quarter in the history of any football game, college, professional, Canadian or Haitian. It was 20 minutes that quarter went on before the wire was restored. I kept the ball moving from the 20-yard line, and it was a very good game. (Laughter) It was better than the other game. (Laughter) But it never got beyond the 20-yard line.

Unfortunately, when the wire came back it turned out that UCLA had scored; and at that point Notre Dame had the ball again. Unfortunately, I had UCLA with the ball down in their own territory; and I had to have Notre Dame with the ball. So I had to have them punt to UCLA and play a series of plays to get back and get the touchdown and get the score even before I could call an end to the quarter. That took another three minutes.

It was really a 23-minute quarter before we got through. The surprising thing was, I didn't receive a single letter, which proves that we at KCMO had no listeners. (Laughter)

Well, this is an honor for me to be asked to participate with you today, just to be on the dais with these dignitaries and in the presence of all of you here. I enjoyed the opportunity, as brief as it was back there, to visit with some of those we salute today. I am sure that, after all of you have a chance to review the accomplishments of these outstanding individuals, you are going to leave this ballroom with a rekindled spirit and a stronger belief in the positive role that intercollegiate athletics has in higher education.

Before I begin introducing our honorees to you, however, I wish to call your attention to your program and ask you to review an impressive list of 80 student-athletes who have combined academic and athletic excellence to earn \$2,000 in NCAA postgraduate scholarships to continue their education. This program began in 1964, and the Association has invested more than \$1½ million in assisting 1,337 students to pursue graduate credit.

The chair of the NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship Committee is seated to my left. He is Fred Jacoby, commissioner of the Mid-American Athletic Conference.

I now ask you to greet a fixture at NCAA Conventions. This is the 36th consecutive year he has attended your annual meetings as sports editor and vice-president of the Nashville Banner.

He was a member of the first Theodore Roosevelt Award Jury; he served as master of ceremonies at the Association's second honors luncheon, and he currently is a member of the Top Ten Selection Committee, which had the responsibility of selecting the honorees on the lower tier.

Long active in the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame, last year he received that organization's Distinguished American Award. Today, he will present a very special award on behalf of the NCAA.

A highly respected newsman and a wonderful human being, Fred M. Russell.

**Fred Russell:** Thank you, Walter. Ladies and gentlemen, I have been requested to present an award on behalf of the NCAA to an individual who has been a lifetime friend. He has been an inspiration to anyone who has had the opportunity to know, work or play for him; and he has earned revered respect. His accomplishments in football coaching are known universally, but his genuine concern for his fellow man and his commitment to higher education are not highly publicized. He is proud of the record his teams have established over the years, but his chest really swells when he begins talking about the number of Alabama players who have earned their degrees.

We, of course, are here to recognize the fact his football teams have won more games than teams coached by any other person in college football history. His winning record surpassed both the legendary Pop Warner and Amos Alonzo Stagg this season.

He began his career in 1945 at Maryland, with a 6-2-1 record, and then provided Kentucky its most successful football era with 60 wins against 23 losses and five ties and four bowl appearances in eight years. He then moved to Texas A&M for four years, establishing a 25-14-2 record before returning to his alma mater in 1959.

He has led the Crimson Tide to five national championships, 12 Southeastern Conference titles, 23 consecutive bowl games and a 224-42-9 record overall. His teams have won 315, lost 81 and had 17 ties.

Now, from the NCAA, a special award to the athletic director and head football coach of the University of Alabama, the winningest coach in college football history, Paul "Bear" Bryant from Alabama.

**Paul Bryant** (University of Alabama): Thank you very much, Fred. Ladies and gentlemen, this award is very meaningful to me for more reasons than one. One is that I told Walter Byers I never expected to really receive anything from the NCAA. (Laughter) I received something from them about 30 years ago, probation; and I released all of my players. (Laughter) Thank God for that, because it taught me a lesson.

I proudly accept this today for the many people that I have been associated with. I proudly share it with them. If it were not for them, it would not have been possible. Thank you very much. I am happy that it comes from the NCAA.

**Mr. Cronkite:** Congratulations, Coach Bryant.

The College Athletics Top Ten permits the Association to salute five outstanding student-athletes from the preceding calendar year and five



former letter winners who have distinguished themselves in their chosen professions on their silver anniversary as college graduates.

The responsibility of choosing these honorees rests with the Top Ten Selection Committee, whose members are listed in your program. It is a difficult assignment, for as outstanding as these individuals are, this is not a unique group of student-athletes. Many other worthy individuals were nominated. The criteria for each of these categories also are listed on the centerfold of your program.

I will begin by introducing Today's Top Five to you. A film clip on each honoree may be seen on the screen as we present the biographical information on the honoree.

Honorees, if you will, please rise and remain standing at your place when I call your name. Following a brief resume of your collegiate career, please accept your award from Secretary-Treasurer Toner at the dais on the lower tier.

*Par J. Arvidsson, University of California, Berkeley, swimming.* His institutional representative is David Maggard, director of athletics.

The University of California, Berkeley's, School of Economics has an international reputation for quality. It consistently is rated in the top five when such rankings are made, and only one in four enrollment applications is accepted.

This ranking is challenge enough for students who have been exposed to the English language since birth; but for a student who must become conversant in a new language, and especially ours, the task to succeed academically becomes even more difficult.

But Par Arvidsson has met those roadblocks directly. He not only has excelled in his academic environment, but he also has gained international stature in swimming. Par Arvidsson established a 3,665 grade-point average majoring in economics and won a gold medal in the 100-meter butterfly at the 1980 Olympics for his native Sweden.

Par won four national collegiate individual championships, leading the Bears to two consecutive NCAA titles, and finished second in his specialties, the 100- and 200-yard butterfly, another year. He also swam on two NCAA championship relay teams and established a world record in the 100-meter butterfly.

Par also won each butterfly event in the 1979 World Cup and swam on two European and one United States record relay teams. He qualified for the 1976 Olympics as a 16-year-old high school student and placed 11th in the 200-meter butterfly, 15th in the 100-meter butterfly and was a member of the seventh-place 800-meter free relay team.

An NCAA postgraduate scholarship honoree, the two-time swimming captain also was a Pacific-10 Conference medal winner. He devotes time to assist the chancellor with receptions for new students and recently represented Olympic athletes at the 11th International Olympic Congress.

Ladies and gentlemen, Par J. Arvidsson, University of California, Berkeley.

*Ambrose Gaines IV, Auburn University, swimming.* His institutional representative is John Cochran, associate director of athletics.

Sports fans everywhere associate the state of Alabama with football. Most everyone is familiar with the great rivalry between Auburn University and the University of Alabama and the all-Americans who have represented the War Eagles and the Crimson Tide.

Fans might be surprised to learn, however, the state's Amateur Athlete of the Year in 1981 and the Southeastern Conference's outstanding performer was a swimmer.

Ambrose "Rowdy" Gaines IV is not your average swimmer, however. This War Eagle is the world's outstanding performer in his specialties, the 100- and 200-yard freestyle events. A five-time individual national collegiate champion, Rowdy Gaines was a dual winner in each event his junior and senior seasons, was the 50-yard freestyle champion as a sophomore and swam on three NCAA championship relay teams.

A member of the 1980 Olympic team, which boycotted the games in Moscow, Rowdy won three gold medals in the 1979 Pan American Games and captured two first-place and one second-place finish in the 1978 World University Games. He was the male swimmer of the year in 1980.

He won six Southeastern Conference individual titles and, as team captain, holds five SEC and six Auburn records.

An active national representative for the leukemia and cancer societies, Rowdy is a national spokesman and athlete advisor for the United States Olympic Committee. He was selected to Who's Who Among Students in American Universities and Colleges and is active in the Big Brothers program.

He also was presented the Cliff Hare Award, as the Auburn athlete best combining athletic abilities, scholarship and character, and earned a "B" average academically, majoring in mass communication.

Ladies and gentlemen, Ambrose "Rowdy" Gaines IV, Auburn University.

*Oliver F. Luck, West Virginia University, football.* His institutional representative is Director of Athletics Fred Schaus.

Oliver Luck's career at West Virginia University epitomizes the student-athlete concept. He not only is outstanding in his sport, but he is one of the top scholars on his campus and participates in a variety of extracurricular activities.

A Rhodes Scholar nominee, Oliver established a 3.96 grade-point average, majoring in history. He also was one of the nation's premier quarterbacks and ranked among the national statistical leaders in total offense and passing his junior and senior seasons.

He set school career total offense records with 6,150 yards in 1,246 plays and 53 rushing and passing touchdowns; and he completed 452 of 888 passing attempts, for 5,658 yards and 42 touchdowns. In all, Oliver owns 12 West Virginia total offense and passing records.

He finished the 1981 regular season in record-breaking style, completing 34 of 48 passes for 360 yards and two touchdowns against Syracuse, leading the Mountaineers to a Peach Bowl victory with an 8-3 record. West Virginia fans also remember his 1980 performance against Temple, when he completed 20 of 25 passes for 314 yards with



four touchdowns and no interceptions.

A member of the West Virginia Mountain Men honorary fraternity and the German Club, he is an active church, civic and youth speaker throughout the state. He has been an Easter Seals volunteer the past two years and is a National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame Scholar-Athlete and an NCAA postgraduate scholarship recipient.

Ladies and gentlemen, Oliver Luck, West Virginia University.

**Kenneth W. Sims**, *University of Texas, Austin, football*. His institutional representative is Tom Morgan, faculty athletic representative.

Opposing football players never have known the gentle side of Ken Sims. You don't establish a reputation as the top defensive lineman in the nation exchanging social pleasantries with the opposition, even if you are six foot, six inches tall and weigh over 250 pounds.

But children in Austin don't worry about his size or his athletic reputation. To them, he's "Special K," a compassionate and caring man who gives many of them the one thing they miss most—love. They are more accustomed to seeing him make guest appearances on children's television shows or working with retarded or underprivileged kids in the community than trying to stop running backs on the football field.

He also has established himself as an important leader on campus, where he is a member of the Silver Spurs honorary and service organization and is a student-spirit leader and unofficial cheerleader for the basketball, swimming and tennis teams.

A two-time consensus all-America defensive tackle, Ken recently was awarded the Lombardi Trophy as the nation's outstanding senior lineman and placed second in the Outland Trophy balloting after a late-season leg injury forced him to miss three games, including the Cotton Bowl. He received three first-place votes for the Heisman Trophy and was the only lineman among the top 10 candidates.

He led the team in tackles, had 23 behind the line of scrimmage and 10 quarterback sacks, caused six fumbles and recovered two, and broke up four passes. Veteran Southwest Conference observers believe Sims may be the best defensive player in the league's history. His performances have been consistently excellent; his coaches say he's never had a mediocre game.

The Longhorn captain twice received all-Southwest Conference defensive player of the year honors and earned a "B" average, majoring in physical education.

Ladies and gentlemen, Kenneth W. Sims, the University of Texas, Austin.

**Lynette Woodard**, *University of Kansas, basketball*. Her institutional representative is Marian Washington, women's basketball coach.

Women's athletics have gained increased popularity the past 10 years, and everyone here hopes the NCAA's decision to administer championships for women will continue to increase the stature and prestige of these sports programs.

The best way to attract attention and to gain credibility is through performance. Lynette Woodard's outstanding career at the University of Kansas has made the international sports community aware of the

rapid improvement of women's basketball in the United States.

Winner of the Wade Award as the outstanding female basketball player of the year, Lynette was a three-time all-America selection. She set a national scoring record of 3,646 career points and established all University of Kansas scoring and rebounding records.

Failing to score in double figures only once during her 139-game career, she averaged 26.3 points and 12.4 rebounds per game. She scored 40 or more points in eight games and had at least 20 rebounds in 10 games.

A member of the 1980 United States Olympic Team that boycotted the games in Moscow, she participated in the World University Games at Spartakiade in 1979 and toured Asia with the United States team in 1978. The three-time Big Eight Conference tournament's most valuable player also captained the Jayhawks.

Lynette also excelled in the classroom and established a "B" average, majoring in speech communication. She helped organize the Big Brothers/Big Sisters program at Kansas, is active in the Special Olympics, was chairperson for the American Lung Association of Kansas State Super Kids and was the NAACP Woman of the Year in Wichita.

Lynette currently is the star attraction in professional basketball in Italy.

Ladies and gentlemen, the first female to receive a Today's Top Five Award, Lynette Woodard, University of Kansas.

Now, Ken Sims will respond on behalf of the Today's Top Five honorees.

**Kenneth W. Sims** (University of Texas, Austin): Ladies and gentlemen of the NCAA and distinguished guests, it is a great honor for each of us to be honored by this organization that prides itself on its concern for student-athletes. The NCAA for 76 years has maintained the true meaning of being a student-athlete.

Our respective universities have enabled us to excel not only in athletics but in academics as well. It is truly an honor for our families and universities to accept these awards.

On behalf of the 1982 Top Five, we will continue to display the talent and hard work that is indicative of achieving such an honor as this. Thank you.

**Mr. Cronkite**: Thank you, Ken. Congratulations to you and good luck to each of the honorees. Now we salute the Silver Anniversary honorees.

**James N. Brown**, actor, *Syracuse University, football*. His institutional representative is Jake Crouthamel, director of athletics.

Long before trivia became a popular pastime in our nation, you could mention Syracuse No. 44 to most any sports fan and expect the correct response. His number and name are synonymous with football greatness on the intercollegiate and professional levels of competition.

Jim Brown's career at Syracuse was outstanding in every respect. He was a consensus all-America in football, lettered in basketball and track and still is recognized as the greatest lacrosse player—he also was

all-America in that sport—in the school's history.

He averaged 4.58 yards per carry with over 2,000 yards rushing during his career and had 6.2 yards per rushing attempt his senior season. He was the first of three Syracuse all-Americans to wear No. 44. Jim scored 43 points against Colgate in 1956 and gained 132 yards rushing in 26 attempts and scored 21 points against TCU in the 1957 Cotton Bowl.

A class marshal and ROTC officer, Jim scored 187 career points, 14 touchdowns and 22 extra points as a senior and averaged 17.5 yards per punt return and 29.1 yards per kickoff return in his career.

His athletic acclaim continued on the professional level. He was the National Football League's player of the year and rookie of the year in 1957 and a unanimous all-pro selection eight of the nine years he wore jersey No. 32 at Cleveland. Jim also led the NFL in rushing eight times during his nine-year career, gaining over 12,000 yards, and scored a record 126 touchdowns during his career.

He was awarded the Hickok Belt as the athlete of the year in 1964, three times won the Jim Thorpe Most Valuable NFL Player Trophy, was player of the year twice and remains the most prolific ground gainer in NFL history.

Jim retired from professional football in 1966 to pursue an acting career. He has had major roles in numerous films, including "The Dirty Dozen," "Ice Station Zebra," "Rio Conchos," "One Hundred Rifles" and "El Condor," and he produced "Do They Ever Cry In America."

Active in numerous show business projects, he also has been attentive to Syracuse alumni affairs since his graduation. Jim participates in numerous charity benefits and organized a "Foot First" program to collect food and donations to assist people in Marshall County, Mississippi, reportedly the nation's poorest county a few years ago.

A Little League volunteer, he was the fund-raising coordinator for Burn Foundation, was the NAACP Image Award chair and is vice-president of that organization's Hollywood chapter and founded and served as president of the Black Economic Union.

A Syracuse Varsity Club Letterman of Distinction, the football and boxing television commentator is a member of the NFL Hall of Fame. Ladies and Gentlemen, James N. Brown, Syracuse University.

*Willie Davis, business executive, Grambling State University, football.* His institutional representative is the athletic director and head football coach, Eddie Robinson.

In his spare time, Willie Davis is a business executive who owns four radio stations in Milwaukee and his own distributing company in Los Angeles. But the major part of his day is spent making significant civic contributions to his city, state and nation.

Willie averages one speaking engagement each week to high school, civic or community groups. He is a member of the Special Los Angeles County Study Commission, Los Angeles County's Special Task Force, the Southern California Businessmen's Association, is president of the Urban League, an Explorer Scout division chair, serves on the Black Peace Officers Association advisory board and is a director for the 1984 Olympic Games, among other activities.

He joined the Schlitz Brewing Company seven years ago as a sales and public relations representative and subsequently has become the second nonfamily member ever to be appointed to its board of directors.

An all-America lineman and team captain, the dean's list student served on the interfraternity council, was president of Kappa Alpha Psi and a member of the Grambling University Foundation.

He played football 12 years and earned all-pro honors six times, leading Green Bay to six divisional and five world championships. As the defensive captain, he did not miss a game during his 10-year career at Green Bay.

He toured Vietnam for the State Department and received the Byron "Whizzer" White Award as the athlete who contributed most to his country, community and team. A member of the University of Chicago Alumni Advisory Council, he is a member of the Fireman's Fund Insurance Company board of directors and the Green Bay Packers Hall of Fame.

Willie taught school during the off-season of his early professional career, before earning a graduate degree in business from the University of Chicago and Case Western Reserve University and entering his distribution and radio businesses.

Ladies and gentlemen, Willie Davis, Grambling State University.

*Jack Kemp, United States Congressman, Occidental College, football.* I regret to tell you Jack Kemp was called to the White House for an 11 a.m. meeting with President Reagan and, somehow or other, he thought that was more important than to be here. Maybe it was a command performance. He has attempted to reschedule the meeting and was called Friday by the President, but the conflict just couldn't be avoided since it focused on the State of the Union message, the budget and taxes. Jack, of course, has had a lot to say about that. He requested me to extend to you and the other honorees his apologies and his very deep personal regret that he could not join us today.

*Ronald J. Kramer, business executive, University of Michigan, football, basketball and track.* His institutional representative is Don Canham, director of athletics.

University of Michigan fans still are reminded of the many thrills Ron Kramer provided for them during his intercollegiate career every time the Wolverines play a football game. He is the analyst for Michigan's radio broadcasts.

The remainder of each week, Ron is vice-president of Paragon Steel Corporation, where he is responsible for labor and customer relations and sales. He joined the company in 1968 and is a stockholder and part owner.

Ron was one of the greatest three-sport athletes, not only in Michigan, where his football jersey No. 87 has been retired, but in Big Ten Conference history. He was an all-America end twice and three-time all-Big Ten selection, led the Wolverines in pass receiving three years and in scoring two seasons, and still holds the record for most touchdown passes caught in a game.

He also earned three letters each in track and basketball, where he

averaged in double figures in scoring each season, with a high of 20.4 points per game as a junior.

A member of Sigma Chi and Michigauma honorary, the basketball captain also was a student representative on the Athletic Board of Control.

His professional career at Green Bay was outstanding. He was all-pro twice with 229 career receptions for 3,272 yards and 16 touchdowns and played on two world championship teams.

A member of the University of Michigan Board of Governors, Ron is active in numerous civic and charitable activities, including the March of Dimes, American Cancer Society, Chamber of Commerce, Society of Crippled Children, Easter Seals, Special Olympics, United Foundation and Boys Club of Metropolitan Detroit.

He has been presented the Distinguished Athlete Citizen and Distinguished Volunteer Leadership awards by the March of Dimes and the Boys Club of Metropolitan Detroit Service Key.

Ron also is a member of the National Football Foundation executive committee and is a director of the NFL Alumni Association. He has been enshrined in the Green Bay Packer, Citizens Saving Athletics Foundation, Michigan and National Football Foundation halls of fame.

Ladies and gentlemen, Ron Kramer, University of Michigan.

*Jim Swink, orthopedic surgeon, Texas Christian University, football and basketball.* His institutional representative is the director of athletics, Frank Windegger.

Personal accomplishments, as you have heard today, are measured in numerous ways. For Jim Swink, his athletic success at Texas Christian University has been recognized by the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame and his skill as an orthopedic surgeon has received acclaim from medical associations on all levels.

But the part of his professional career for which he has the highest personal regard was the year he spent treating American soldiers in Vietnam. Many people know Jim served his country as a hospital unit captain, but few are aware he was awarded the Bronze Star, the Army Commendation Medal for Valor, the Air Medal, the Combat Medic Badge, the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry and a Purple Heart as a battalion surgeon on front-line duty during combat.

His concern for his fellow man has remained the foundation of his practice, and these contributions were recognized most recently when he was presented a Distinguished American award by the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame.

Jim was one of the greatest running backs in Southwest Conference history and the only TCU back who has ever gained over 1,000 yards rushing in a season. He established the current SWC record of 8.2 yards per carry that year. He continues to hold school records for career yards; average per carry, with 6.3 100-yard-plus rushing games in a season and a career; and touchdowns and points in a game, season and career.

A two-time all-America, he gained 235 yards in 15 carries for a 15.7

average and scored four touchdowns and two extra points against Texas in 1955. Additionally, he was his team's leading pass receiver and led TCU to two conference championships and a Cotton Bowl victory.

Jim was second in the Heisman Trophy balloting. The Texas Amateur Athlete of the Year was presented the Southwest Conference and the Swede Nelson National Sportsmanship awards. He has been inducted into the Texas and TCU sports halls of fame.

This football cocaptain, who also lettered two years in basketball, received academic all-America recognition three times and was elected Mr. TCU as a senior.

Jim graduated from the University of Texas Southwestern Medical School and interned at Sacramento County Hospital. He began a general practice, entered the Army for two years, and was an orthopedic surgery resident at the internationally renowned Scott and White Clinic before entering private practice in Fort Worth and becoming chief of surgery at All Saints Hospital.

Ladies and gentlemen, Jim Swink, Texas Christian University.

Responding on behalf of the Silver Anniversary honorees is Ron Kramer.

**Ronald J. Kramer:** Thank you, Mr. Cronkite. Mr. President, Bill Cosby, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen: Under the NCAA free-substitution rule, I have been designated to represent Jim Brown, Willie Davis, Jack Kemp, Jim Swink and myself to accept this distinguished 25-year Silver Anniversary Award.

My time limit is two minutes to let you all know what five people took 25 years to do.

In my experience I learned well the value of two minutes from a game in which Vince Lombardi taught me that the possibilities of accomplishments can be rendered in a short time. I think Paul Horning, the Golden Boy, expressed it well, "Practice, practice, practice." (Laughter)

Jack Kemp was to deliver this response; but, unfortunately, in his new career he is holding out for four minutes. And that is four minutes with his boss, President Reagan, who deemed it necessary for the old quarterback to play the big game in Washington, D.C.

There are big games played every day in our lives; and if we play hard, if we play fair, it should prove to be fruitful and enjoyable to all of us.

From Jim Brown, the greatest athlete I have ever known; Willie Davis, a satire in determination; Jack Kemp, suave and debonaire, maybe our next president; Jim Swink with his singleness of purpose, and me, thanks to all of you and thanks to all responsible for our success--family, coaches, teammates and friends, and especially the fans.

I hope our contributions and our future endeavors will continue to make you proud of today's choice.

**Mr. Cronkite:** Thank you, Ron, and congratulations to you all.

Valor is strength of mind or spirit which enables an individual to brave danger with boldness or firmness. The Award of Valor is presented by the NCAA only to those who have exhibited exceptional bravery. It recognizes a coach or administrator currently associated



with intercollegiate athletics or a current or former varsity letter winner at a member institution, who, when confronted with a situation involving personal danger, averted or minimized potential disaster by courageous action or noteworthy bravery.

Certainly, the definition of valor and the criteria established by the NCAA for this prestigious award were tailor-made for the heroic action of the individual we honor today, Timothy J. McCarthy.

Most of you probably saw on television his confrontation with death and his reaction to that dangerous situation. He was firm and bold in fulfilling his assignment, and his courageous action and noteworthy bravery helped avert potential disaster for our nation.

The date was Monday, March 29. The place was outside a Washington, D.C., hotel. The scene was an attempted assassination of the President of the United States.

We vividly recall the scenes televised repeatedly and the news accounts which followed this act of violence. What you probably did not know is the Secret Service agent who positioned himself between the President and the attempted assassin is a former University of Illinois defensive halfback.

He was shot in the abdomen and knocked to the ground by the force of the bullet just before President Reagan was pushed into his limousine. After a 12-day stay in the hospital, the agent returned to the Presidential Protective Division of the Secret Service, an assignment he began in 1979 under President Carter.

He has received numerous honors signifying his noteworthy bravery, including the U.S. Secret Service Valor Award and the U.S. Treasury Department Outstanding Performance Award. Now, President Frank will present to him the NCAA Award of Valor.

Tim earned two varsity letters at Illinois and graduated in 1971 with a major in finance. He joined the Secret Service six months later and was assigned to the Chicago field office to investigate counterfeiting and forgery, before being transferred to the Presidential Protective Division in 1979.

Ladies and gentlemen, Timothy J. McCarthy, the University of Illinois, Champaign.

**President Frank:** Mr. McCarthy, on behalf of the NCAA, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to present this Award of Valor to you.

**Timothy J. McCarthy:** I would like to thank the folks at the University of Illinois, the athletic director, Neale Stoner, and sports information director, Tab Bennett, and Chancellor Cribbitt for nominating me for this award. However, it is tough for someone in my profession to get the Award of Valor. I told them not to expect me back next year to get another one. (Laughter)

I also would like to thank the NCAA, whose role in the development of student-athletes and citizens may help one day to make my profession extinct. I would also like to accept this on behalf of another man, Jim Brady, who is recovering well now, and Tom Delahanty, a District of Columbia police officer, retired as a result of injuries, and all the men and the women of the Secret Service. Thank you.

**Mr. Cronkite:** The presentation of the Theodore Roosevelt Award is the focal point of the NCAA honors program. The specific criteria and a list of the previous honorees are listed in your program.

The Teddy Award was initiated 15 years ago, and this prestigious honor has been bestowed upon presidents of the United States; space pioneers; military, government, judicial and medical leaders; humanitarians, and entertainers. The common link among all of the recipients was earning varsity letters during their collegiate careers.

Last year, most of you will recall the Theodore Roosevelt Award was presented to Art Linkletter, an individual from whom many of us learned the importance of developing a positive attitude toward life and that, yes, people are funny.

Today, the NCAA recognizes an individual who has had and continues to have a positive influence on our children and our grandchildren through an educational approach to television entertainment.

Bill Cosby is a rare talent. He is a publisher. He has had leading roles in entertaining, documentary and educational motion pictures. He has recorded musical, comedy and educational albums; and he has starred in numerous television documentaries and programs.

Children, and perhaps many in the audience, best know him for his long-time cartoon favorite, "Fat Albert," for which he was the creator and is the narrator and writer. And each of us should be grateful our impressionable youngsters have an opportunity to broaden their educational base through a popular cartoon which includes fantasy and reality but also a subtle, yet effective, lesson spotlighting right and wrong.

Each week, "Fat Albert" begins with the message: "Here's Bill Cosby coming at you with music and fun; and, if you're not careful, you may learn something before it is done."

The December 12, 1981, edition of TV Guide reported, "Parents will discover 'Fat Albert' is the model cartoon for blending fun with learning." It further stated, "Perhaps the best cartoon program on television, and the most thoughtfully presented, is CBS's 'Fat Albert,' starring Bill Cosby, who not only appears as himself but does several of the voices of the animated cast of characters."

"Cosby presents the cartoon material, acting as a parent or adult friend. He makes the transition for the child from the real to the fantasy world, much in the way a parent or grandparent says, 'Now I'm going to tell you a story.' He reappears during the show to explain the actions, define words and point out a moral. We wish more cartoons were presented by adults who could serve to bridge the gap between the outrageous fantasy of the cartoon and the child's understanding of the world."

"Fat Albert" has received the Children's Theatre Association Seal of Excellence and the Ohio State University Award for Meritorious Achievement in Education Broadcasting.

Although Bill Cosby's academic pursuits often have been interrupted and delayed, the value of education and the emphasis placed on it by his

mother always have been a deep-rooted motivation in his life. Raised in a housing project in Philadelphia, he dropped out of Germantown High School during the 11th grade. He spent the next four years on a Navy destroyer and earned his high school diploma completing correspondence courses.

He then enrolled at Temple University. He was a versatile track performer, often scoring points in the high jump, shot put, low hurdles, javelin and discus throw, and won the Middle Atlantic Conference university division high jump championship in 1962. He also lettered in football and participated in basketball.

While attending Temple, he also worked part-time as a waiter and bartender. His popularity as a comedian quickly spread throughout the Quaker City, and he again decided to delay his education to accept a \$60-a-week job in New York City's Greenwich Village.

His career blossomed. He became the first Black to star in a television series and earned three Emmy awards as the best actor in a dramatic program for his role in "I Spy." He also received an Emmy for a Bill Cosby special.

His comedy record albums have sold over 11 million copies, and he is the recording industry's all-time best-selling comedian. He has had seven gold and six platinum records, and he has received five Grammy awards for the best comedy album.

He also has appeared in several motion pictures, including "California Suite," and he has a 10-week commitment with the Las Vegas Hilton Hotel each year.

But during this time, Bill also has filled the academic void he created in his life when he left Temple. He completed bachelor's degree requirements from the Temple School of Communications. He earned a master's degree from the University of Massachusetts in 1972 and then earned a doctorate of education from that university in 1977, with a dissertation entitled "An Integration of the Visual Media Via Fat Albert and the Cosby Kids Into the Elementary School Curriculum as a Teaching Aid and Vehicle to Achieve Increased Learning."

That was some title. Bill, was there any dissertation after the title? (Laughter) This study serves as a model teaching aid for elementary school teachers throughout the United States.

Bill also has had an extraordinarily successful career promoting products on television and has been named Star Presenter of the Year by Advertising Age. He has received the NAACP Image Award and is active in the Hemophilia Foundation, Studio Watts Workshop, Black Film Foundation, American Sickle Cell Foundation and numerous other causes.

An outstanding tennis player who participates in numerous celebrity and charitable events each year, he also is active in the alumni and athletic affairs of Temple University. He received the first Order of the Owl Award presented by the Temple General Alumni Association.

Bill and his wife, Camille, reside in a 140-year-old house near Amherst with their son and four daughters. They like the New England country environment, I am told. But the remoteness of their home has

caused the Cosby children to be slow to realize just who their father is. His son got the message when he accompanied him to a studio one day and saw him go into a sound booth and record voices of some of the Cosby cartoon kids. When Bill came out, his son ran over and hugged him and said, "You're Fat Albert."

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to present a comedian, actor, author, philosopher, educator and a family man, William H. Cosby Jr., Temple University.

**President Frank:** Bill, in recognizing your superb career as a student and an athlete and your continuing commitment to the highest personal standards, I am pleased to present you the 1982 Theodore Roosevelt Award for your distinguished contributions to the communicative arts and the positive influence you have on children throughout the world. Congratulations.

**William H. Cosby Jr.:** After listening to all of the yardage gained by the football players and the records broken by the swimmers, I feel like Marv Throneberry. (Laughter) I will accept anything when they put my picture on it. (Laughter) Now, I am beginning to wonder, do they have white wood for other fellows? (Laughter) This is going to be one-sided from now on. You better get some birch or something. (Laughter)

It was embarrassing for awhile when West Virginia's Mr. Luck was up here and you just happened to pull our school out to show how generous we are on defense. We are much better than that, aren't we, Ernie? (Laughter) This gentleman, we have known each other; I got to know him when I quit school. (Laughter) The man wouldn't talk to me while I was going to school.

The year I decided to quit, he called me in his office to tell me that I was the only fullback left. I didn't know if he was telling me how dumb I was. (Laughter) He asked me if I would stay. I said, "No, I don't feel like it. I just don't feel like studying. I am not doing myself any good." He said, "Well, I understand." He said, "That show business is rough. I would advise you to think it over, and don't go into show business. Stay here and just think it over."

I did; and I came back and I said, "Ernie, I am going to leave." He said, "Well, the best of luck to you; and give me back your letter. If you don't want to play the game, you don't get a letter." (Laughter) I wish to God to this day that I had played for some coaches who knew what they were doing. (Laughter)

Ernie recruited some of the worst people I have known. We had the ability, it was there; you can ask anybody who ever played. The coaches didn't know what they had. We kept losing. It wasn't our fault. They gave us the plays, they said this is where we are going and the teams didn't go there. (Laughter) Then at the half time we were yelled at because we were doing what the people were telling us to do, but the people kept going some place else. (Laughter)

Ernie was a true athletic director. He just stood there with a new topcoat each week. (Laughter) I told you I would get you, Ernie. (Laughter) I said that I was going to be nice to him. One of the greatest moments I remember, we were going to play a game; and, you see, the

reason there was no film on me is because the school did not give numbers on the front and back. You got a number on the front, which is where I was all the time when I fell, so you can't tell who I am or where I am.

Also, they used the film again. They took that time and they would show it on what I call "who is that?" Football coaches and basketball coaches are alike. They bring you into the room and they say, "Okay. We are just going to run the film and forget about it. I am not going to say anything," which is what the players call "who is that?"

Then they start to run the film, and maybe you get to where you kick the ball and you hear somebody yelling, "Who is that?" Then the football players go under the chair and hide. (Laughter)

I have been given five minutes to say what I have to say. I wanted to thank everybody. I wanted to say how much of a pleasure it is to see all of these athletes that I don't know, and the ones that I do know and the respect that I have for all of them, especially the fellows around my age who have since come out of pro sports and gone on to businesses, where it is a tough thing to come off--well, not these guys, because they have been out 25 years and they didn't make that much money.

It is a difficult thing to be making what Mr. Sims is going to make and then have to make a living off of a degree. (Laughter) I don't know what your degree is in, son, but if you are making \$400,000 a year, it is going to be rough when you come out. (Laughter) You are not going to be doing any Coca-Cola commercials and you are not going to be doing any Jell-O and what else do I do? You are not getting those. (Laughter)

It is a pleasure to hear Walter Cronkite say my name. I was glad he didn't say, "And that is the way it was." That means I am still alive.

I want to thank you for this award and thank you for thinking of me. Theodore Roosevelt, or Teddy Roosevelt, I consider the Vincent Lombardi of the presidents. He was. I am glad I never played for Lombardi. He was a rough man. I heard he would yell at you. (Laughter) Thank you and good afternoon.

**President Frank:** Thank you again, Bill. I am pleased to present the institutional plaque to Ernie Casale, director of athletics at Temple University, commemorating the selection of one of its distinguished alumni as the recipient of the 1982 Theodore Roosevelt Award.

**Mr. Cronkite:** I will have to tell you about Bill Cosby. He took up tennis at one time and about three days later he was beating everybody on the court. He was the most graceful tennis player I think I have ever seen in my life, and that includes all of those at Wimbledon and the rest of the world. Now, he is one up on me.

I have really enjoyed this opportunity to serve here today as your master of ceremonies. It has been good to renew some old acquaintances and establish some new friends. I commend you for taking time from your demanding Convention schedule to pay special tribute to current and former student-athletes who excel in their academic, business and athletic pursuits.

Speaking for the CBS television network, we are excited about our new relationship with the NCAA. We are off to a fast start in

basketball; and everyone is thrilled about our involvement with the national championship, especially, to be televising in March the Final Four from the Louisiana Superdome, with over 60,000 fans in attendance. We also are excited about the joint venture we will have with ABC to originate coverage of college football in the fall.

I thank you all for inviting me to share this distinguished podium with you.

**President Frank:** Thank you, Mr. Cronkite. I know your presence has made this day even more memorable for our honored guests. As a token of our appreciation for serving us so ably as the master of ceremonies and to remind you of the admiration and respect our Association holds for you, I am pleased to present a gift to you; and I hope that you and Mrs. Cronkite can find a place for it.

This has been a great day and I congratulate each of the honorees. Now, if you will please rise, President Roaden will offer our benediction.

**Mr. Roaden:** Let us pray. Heavenly Father, we have been pleased with your abundant grace and love. Go with us as we leave this assembly with the knowledge that whatsoever is good and whatsoever is perfect are gifts from God. May we use these gifts for your glory and honor and for the glory of all mankind, your creations. Amen.

work of the Convention four years ago. We trust that the early adjournment will enable all delegates to remain in attendance throughout the business session.

There are certain other procedures we employ in attempting to use our time efficiently. The chair will attempt to "eyeball" as many votes as possible, calling for a count by the Voting Committee only when there is doubt as to the majority. I ask all delegates to refrain from calling for a vote count unless one seems necessary to determine the disposition of the issue.

If the delegates intend to debate an issue, we ask that they be at one of the microphone locations and prepared to speak when the motion has been made and seconded. If the chair sees no one at a microphone, the vote will be called as quickly as possible. Please note that the microphones are numbered. We will try to use those numbers in recognizing speakers. Of course, that procedure will be applicable for tomorrow.

On bylaw issues, the chair will call for the vote in the same division sequence each time: Division I first, then Division II and then Division III. The results of a division's vote will not be announced until all divisions have voted.

In the division round tables this morning, your attention was called to any errors or corrections in your Convention Program. I will not repeat those at this time.

Each year, in this session, we review the voting and speaking privileges for NCAA Conventions. Each active member institution may have four accredited delegates, one voting and three alternates. They may exchange the voting privilege among them because all have been approved as voters by the chief executive officer of the institution. Active members also may have visiting delegates if they desire, but those visitors may not participate in the Convention in terms of speaking or voting.

Allied conferences which have voting privileges in accordance with the constitution have the same voting and speaking rights as active members. An allied conference that does not have the vote, and any affiliate organization, may have one official delegate who is permitted to speak but not to vote. We ask that these individuals identify themselves and their affiliations clearly when they rise to speak.

In fact, to assist the recorder of these proceedings, we ask all who speak to identify themselves and their affiliations. Those delegates wearing Convention badges with ribbons are permitted to speak. Those without ribbons are visitors and may not participate other than as observers.

I would remind you that any delegate wishing to withdraw a proposal should notify the staff in advance of the business session.

Please be reminded that the business session will begin promptly at 8 a.m. tomorrow. We will begin with the two consent packages in the program. Those are designed to include only noncontroversial or housekeeping proposals and will be voted on as a package of amendments unless a delegate requests that a proposal be removed for a separate vote.

## 76th ANNUAL CONVENTION OPENING GENERAL SESSION

Monday Afternoon, January 11, 1982

The 76th annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was called to order at 3:15 p.m. by NCAA President James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri), in the Imperial Ballroom of the Hyatt Regency Hotel, Houston, Texas.

### 1. OPENING REMARKS

**President Frank:** As you know, our meetings are conducted under the procedures prescribed by Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised. One such procedure is the need to adopt the Convention program prior to beginning our business. I now will ask for a motion to adopt the printed program of this Convention so we may proceed with the work of the Convention.

**Douglas Weaver** (Michigan State University): I move we adopt the Convention program.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

**President Frank:** Robert's Rules of Order provides that procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization's own traditional and customary procedures. This Association has a number of such procedures, and several of them are reviewed in the introductory section of your program. Those also appeared in the Official Notice of the Convention, mailed to you more than seven weeks ago.

In addition, you will find in your program a reference listing of all of the Association's legislation dealing with our Conventions.

All of the NCAA's Convention procedures are designed to assure fairness and equitable treatment for all members, as well as to eliminate any questions of propriety and to expedite your work as delegates. I will not take the time today to explain all of the parliamentary procedures used to assure fairness. I will remind the delegates, however, that the chair fully intends to apply those procedures throughout.

We will, for example, be aware of the number of times that an individual speaks on a given issue and the length of the time taken by any one speaker, both matters controlled by Robert's Rules of Order. Also, Robert's Rules of Order states that any motion to table which is designed to prevent debate or to kill a motion is dilatory and thus will be ruled out of order. Only a two-thirds majority of this body can suppress debate on a circularized proposal.

Once again, the Council and Executive Committee have scheduled the adjournment of the Convention for noon Wednesday. This is designed to eliminate the quorum problem that thwarted some of the



It is now my privilege to identify for you the several Convention committees and the chair of each. The Nominating Committee is chaired by Jack Davis of Oregon State University. The Men's Committee on Committees is chaired by Fred Jacoby of the Mid-American Conference. The Women's Committee on Committees is chaired by Emma Best, University of District of Columbia.

The Voting Committee is chaired by Frank Windegger of Texas Christian University. The Committee on Memorial Resolutions is chaired by the Rev. Joseph Eagan from the University of San Francisco. The Committee on Credentials is chaired by Richard Clower of Western Maryland College.

Those committees, as appointed appropriately by the Council and the Executive Committee, are listed in your program. In accordance with our procedures, the reports of the sports committees and general committees are not presented orally but are included in the printed Annual Reports, a copy of which you received when you registered. The report of the secretary-treasurer and that of the Executive Committee also appear in the Annual Reports.

At the beginning of the business session tomorrow morning, we will entertain motions to receive all of those reports. This gives you time to review those items in the Annual Reports before you are asked to approve them.

At this point in the agenda, we move to the report of the NCAA Council. To present that report is Joe Geraud, faculty athletic representative at the University of Wyoming, District 7 vice-president and chair of the Division I Steering Committee.

## 2. REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

**Joseph R. Geraud** (University of Wyoming): Mr. President and members of the Association, I am pleased to present to you this afternoon the annual report of the NCAA Council. The NCAA constitution provides that the establishment and direction of the Association's general policies between Conventions are the responsibilities of the Council, which is composed of 20 persons and the officers. This report is to inform you of the Council's work during the past year.

You will find the abridged minutes of the 1981 Council meetings and several telephone conferences in your copy of the 1980-81 Annual Reports. These abridged minutes provide a summary of the Council's activities and deliberations during the past 12 months.

Because those minutes do appear in the Annual Reports, this oral report will include only a few specific topics that occupied a great deal of the Council's time and attention and that deserve special mention here.

### Implementation of Governance Plan

After the Convention a year ago endorsed the NCAA Governance Plan regarding programs, services and representation for women's athletics within the NCAA, the Council took actions throughout the year in a number of areas to implement the will of the membership in adopting that plan. These actions included the appointment of

women's sports committees, appointment of women to positions on committees throughout the NCAA structure and numerous interpretations and legislative recommendations dealing with the application of NCAA rules to women's sports.

A number of those recommendations appear in your Convention program as legislative proposals generated by the Special Committee on Legislative Review, which is continuing its assigned task of evaluating NCAA rules for both men and women. The work of that committee will continue to be significant in assuring that the NCAA programs for women's athletics will provide what the governance plan intended—that is, another opportunity for the governance of women's athletics and increased opportunities for women student-athletes and women professionals.

### Special Convention

As you know, the NCAA Council called a special Convention of the Association—the fourth in history—after numerous Division I member institutions recommended such a special meeting to treat the need to restructure Division I and Division I-A Football. That special Convention was held last month in St. Louis; and, even though the business at hand dealt primarily with Division I concerns, almost exactly one-half of the Association's voting members attended, including more than 95 percent of all Division I members.

The NCAA Council sponsored a series of amendments at that special meeting, all dealing with the restructuring of Division I-A Football, additional controls on the overall membership of Division I and television issues related to the football restructuring. Those proposals were developed, for the most part, by the Special Committee on NCAA Governance, Organization and Services—chaired by our president, James Frank—and its Special Subcommittee on Division I Restructuring, chaired by Richard H. Perry of the University of Southern California.

The Council believes that it was responsive to the desires of these members in calling the special Convention. It also believes that the proposals adopted in St. Louis will provide for the type of meaningful restructuring that was intended by the Council in its 1978 restructuring plan. In the general round table later this afternoon, Capt. J. O. Coppedge of the U.S. Naval Academy, who chairs the Classification Committee, will present a classification report that includes comments on implementation of the special Convention actions, so I will not dwell further on that topic.

### Football Television

The Council concentrated on matters involving the televising of college football on several occasions during 1981, including approval of the procedures by which the membership overwhelmingly approved the new 1982-1985 Football Television Plan. The Council has carefully evaluated the work of the Football Television Committee in developing and negotiating the new plan and has ratified the decisions of the committee in that regard.

I think it is fair to say that members of the Council and the Football



Television Committee firmly believe the new 1982-1985 two-network television package is by far the most attractive and advantageous television agreement in the history of college athletics. I will not pursue that point in these remarks because the matter of football television will be the primary topic in the general round table, beginning in just a few minutes. Also, the full 1980-81 report of the Football Television Committee is available at the registration desk.

### Enforcement

Numerous items regarding the Association's enforcement operations were considered by the Council during 1981, and the Council approved a restructuring of the enforcement department after a review of its operations.

In considering recommendations and comments from the Committee on Infractions, the Recruiting Committee and the special coaches' Subcommittee on Recruiting, it has become apparent that seldom, if ever, has there been as much support among coaches and athletic administrators for increased severity in the penalties to be imposed on those institutions and individuals responsible for violations of legislation adopted by the membership.

As a result, the Council in October adopted a statement in that regard and forwarded it to the Committee on Infractions. The statement appears in the abridged minutes of the Council meeting, but I think it is important to read it here:

"The Council believes that actions taken to reorganize and expand the NCAA enforcement department should result in more timely processing of infractions cases, and additional penalties being recommended by the Committee on Infractions and Council should result in more effective penalties in completed cases. In response to suggestions by football and basketball coaches participating on the Special NCAA Subcommittee on Recruiting, the Council also believes that more severe penalties should be imposed in future infractions cases to disadvantage in greater degrees the individuals and institutions involved in those cases."

### Other Activities

The Council has been involved in many other activities and topics during the past year—including the unfortunate need to deal with various legal matters including suits filed against the NCAA by the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women and by the College Football Association. In the former case, the AIAW is attempting to prove that the NCAA is engaging in monopoly practices relative to women's athletics.

In the CFA action, the universities of Oklahoma and Georgia, in behalf of the CFA board of directors, are attempting to terminate the colleges' ability to control football television by arguing that such controls violate the Federal antitrust laws and the principal bases of such controls—for example, limitations as to the number of times a given college may appear on television each year or every two years—are illegal. The CFA leadership apparently has reaffirmed its commitment to this lawsuit since the December special Convention.

When you read the abridged Council minutes in the Annual Reports, you will note those matters and others.

Each year, the Council spends an appreciable amount of time in each of its meetings dealing with interpretations of NCAA legislation. The Council is specifically charged with that responsibility between Conventions. When the Council approves an interpretation, it is binding upon the membership—as set forth in Article 6, Section 2, of the constitution.

The Council also considers numerous membership applications and classification matters during the year, and these matters increase as the membership grows. As you know, the Association's membership reached an all-time high of 906 institutions and organizations—including 753 active members—in September.

Mr. President, that concludes this report of the NCAA Council. Since my oral presentation is intended only as a summary, I recommend that the delegates read the minutes of the 1981 Council meetings in the Annual Reports. They then will be prepared to vote on a motion tomorrow to accept and approve the full report of the Council.

**President Frank:** Thank you, Joe. Reverend Egan is not able to be with us this afternoon. Making the report on the Committee on Memorial Resolutions in his behalf is Mary Ellen Cloninger of the University of Wyoming.

### 3. REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS

**Mary Ellen Cloninger** (University of Wyoming): Mr. President and members of the Association, I first wish to recognize the other members of the committee. They are Ken Gardner of Northeast Missouri State University and Gary Wodder from the University of Scranton. The individuals who have passed away since our last Convention, whom we honor this afternoon, are the following:

Dwight Aultman III, University of New Hampshire  
J. Lyman Bingham, University of Denver and the U.S. Olympic Committee  
Richard K. Brown, St. Peter's College  
Dave Busey, Lycoming College  
Russell Carman, Lock Haven State College  
Clayton B. Carroll, McNeese State University  
William E. Crouch, Eastern Michigan University  
C. Vincent Cuddy, Providence College  
Albert S. "Abb" Curtis, Southwest Conference  
John M. Dougherty, La Salle College  
Wilfred "Dukes" Duford, St. Louis University  
Richard Edwards, Eastern Montana College  
James F. Elliott, Villanova University  
Charles "Bud" Finger, Stanford University  
George Gallet, University of Miami (Florida)  
Frank N. Gardner, Drake University  
Jack Green, Vanderbilt University  
Bruce Hale, St. Mary's College (California)  
Elmer Hertel, Wartburg College  
John Hudzik, Ohio State University  
Harold "Pinky" Kraft, University of North Dakota  
Joe Kuharich, University of San Francisco

John Laetz, Michigan State University  
 William Lane, Bucknell University  
 Charles Law, Suffolk University  
 Harbin Lawson, University of Georgia  
 John B. Lewang, Northern Illinois University  
 Clyde Littlefield, University of Texas, Austin  
 Frederick Luehring, Princeton University  
 Hugh G. McCurdy, Wesleyan University  
 Warren P. McGuirk, University of Massachusetts  
 Shirley Majors, University of the South  
 Ricardo Mestres, Ivy League  
 Hollis A. Moore, Bowling Green State University  
 Lyle Mullins, Northern Arizona University  
 John E. Noonan, Harvard University  
 A. W. "Rock" Norman, Clemson University  
 Ben Plotnicki, University of Tennessee, Knoxville  
 Roman Rankin, University of Maine, Orono  
 J. Juan Reid, Colorado College  
 Karl Schladerman, Michigan State University  
 Herbert L. Smith, Wayne State University (Michigan)  
 Omar Smith, Texas A&M University  
 Richard "Moe" Smith, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale  
 Paul Stewart, University of Illinois, Champaign  
 Ed Struck, Illinois State University  
 Lee J. Tressel, Baldwin-Wallace College  
 Lynn O. "Pappy" Waldorf, University of California, Berkeley  
 John Warren, University of Oregon  
 Cliff Wettig, Samford University  
 James Wilkinson, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale  
 Arthur R. Winters Sr., Lafayette College  
 George Young, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Please honor these individuals and their service to intercollegiate athletics by rising with me for a moment of silent prayer.

[The assembly stood in silent memory of these departed colleagues.]

**President Frank:** Thank you, Mary Ellen. At this time, I will turn the program over to the secretary-treasurer of the NCAA, John Toner, who will now chair the general round table.

## GENERAL ROUND TABLE

**Monday Afternoon, January 11, 1982**

The general round table convened at 3:30 p.m. in the Imperial Ballroom, with Secretary-Treasurer John L. Toner of the University of Connecticut presiding.

**Secretary-Treasurer Toner:** Welcome to the 1982 general round table. Today we intend to provide you with reports on what occurred at this morning's division round tables, have a report on the first NCAA championships for women, inform you of current events concerning membership classification and review the status of the Association's football television program.

Each of our speakers will be happy to take questions from the floor, though with the panel on television I am going to ask that you hold questions until all panelists have spoken.

We are scheduled to meet until 5 p.m., although I am willing to continue until all questions have been answered or until we begin to intrude on other meetings, a number of which have been set for 5:30.

We are going to start the afternoon by asking the chair of each steering committee to outline what happened in the respective divisions. We will start off with Division I and Joe Geraud from the University of Wyoming.

**Joseph R. Geraud (University of Wyoming):** Most all of you were at the Division I round table meeting this morning, I do believe. It is a pleasure to report that the division did have the opportunity to go through the proposed amendments in the 1982 program. Review was conducted of legislation regarding football television, with specific emphasis upon specifics of the application to Divisions I-A and I-AA.

We had a report from the basketball committee with respect to automatic qualification, as it relates to some of the amendments proposed. We conducted a review of other legislation pertaining to Division I; and I would say it was one of the quietest round tables I have attended, so apparently the membership is appreciative of the intent and the language of the proposed amendments.

Division I was addressed by President Swearer of Brown University, who delivered a statement with respect to the purposes and policies of the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

Division I round table, finally, heard requests from six member institutions for waivers of Division I-A criteria resulting from the December special Convention. The division round table denied all six requests.

**Secretary-Treasurer Toner:** Are there any questions for Mr. Geraud? If not, we will call on Don Russell, director of athletics at

Wesleyan University, to give the Division III report.

**Donald M. Russell** (Wesleyan University): As with Division I, the Division III round table was well attended; and it appeared to be a very productive meeting. We reviewed the legislation that is proposed for this Convention; and we did dwell on some Division III matters, one being Amendment No. 54 where a liberalization of the five-year rule was fully supported.

We discussed some transfer rules for Division III, which were supported. The dues increase amendment was discussed in full. The multidivision Resolution No. 86 was not met with favor by Division III. The majority favored the one-division move for Amendment No. 87. There was a request for further study of the movement by sport from division to division.

A Division III matter in establishing an enrollment criteria was defeated strongly in a straw vote. As for Amendments 96 and 97, the so-called tryout amendments, Division III does not seem to be in favor of this concept. As far as the terminal championship amendment is concerned, No. 110, there was a straw vote; and 77 favored the amendment and 72 objected to it.

There was a request made to move Amendment No. 112, which deals with Division III athletes moving to Division I championships, ahead of Amendment No. 110. The NCAA Council expansion, as proposed in No. 119, was discussed; and the Division III round table agreed to postpone it for further study on that particular matter. Division III is working on a philosophical statement and also on some clarification of its financial aid limitation language.

The chief executive officers' meeting, which was held in September, was also reported on and the favorability of continuing that was approved by the round table.

**Secretary-Treasurer Toner:** Representing the Division II Steering Committee is Aldo Sebben, director of athletics at Southwest Missouri State University.

**Aldo A. Sebben** (Southwest Missouri State University): We had an excellent round table discussion in Division II. We reviewed all legislation, and we had an excellent exchange of all Division II items. We took several straw votes. According to our straw votes, we opposed No. 68, we favored No. 78. If it is amended, we were opposed to No. 92.

Two waivers were granted, Davis and Elkins College and Florida Atlantic University.

**Secretary-Treasurer Toner:** Now we have a special report. This fall, in response to your actions of the past two Conventions, the NCAA initiated sponsorship of championships for women student-athletes. Before the academic year is concluded, 29 such events will have been conducted. Here to report on the fall meets and tournaments and to forecast what lies ahead in winter and spring is a member of the NCAA Executive Committee, Linda Estes. Linda is director of athletics for women at the University of New Mexico.

**Linda K. Estes** (University of New Mexico): The NCAA has had nine championships to date for women, in the sports of cross country,

field hockey and volleyball. Approximately 30 percent of the NCAA membership have participated in NCAA women's championships this fall. Reports from the championships have indicated they have been successful. Female student-athletes have gained visibility through bowls such as the Volleyball Bowl, cable television exposure and local media coverage.

The Division I volleyball championship was an outstanding success. The championship contest had approximately 6,500 spectators, which we believe is the largest number of spectators ever to attend a collegiate women's volleyball championship. There were 10,000 spectators over the two days of competition.

The winter championships are proceeding smoothly with 30 to 35 percent of the NCAA member institutions electing to participate. The exceptions are Division I basketball, with 41 percent, and Division I swimming, with 50 percent.

**Secretary-Treasurer Toner:** We will go right on to Capt. Coppedge, athletic director at the United States Naval Academy and chair of the Classification Committee, who will report on the status of reclassification of members from Division I-A to I-AA and other classification matters of current interest.

**Capt. J. O. Coppedge** (U.S. Naval Academy): My intention today is to comment briefly on the status of the divisional structure of the NCAA and reclassification of institutions which no longer meet the criteria for membership in Division I-A Football as a result of the action of the December Convention and to review legislation affecting membership and classification which will be before this Convention.

I believe that, through the work in recent years of the classification, steering and governance committees and the legislative review committee this year, there has been developed a sound set of rules governing the classification procedures and reasonable criteria for membership in the respective divisions. The change in criteria for I-A Football in December, it seems to me, completes these tasks, subject, perhaps, to some fine tuning.

The Classification Committee is not interested in a fourth division for some major football institutions or through splitting Division III. Both concepts are before this Convention.

The action in December to require sponsorship of eight sports for membership in Division I was an important addition, and we recognize that the steady influx of members into Division I has led to several of this year's legislative proposals.

Concerning football reclassification, the committee requested certification of 1981 paid attendance data by Division I-A colleges in December. Ninety-six of the 137 institutions have responded as of this date. As you can see, some additional information remains to be gathered. Several institutions have reported audited figures are not available until early spring.

We have found apparent discrepancies in some of the figures submitted. It has been impressed upon the committee that an early resolution of I-A/I-AA reclassification is needed to avoid rumors and possible inequities during the current recruiting season. The Council

responded by directing the committee to report to it by February 1. It further directed that any institution which has not submitted the necessary data by that date shall not be listed in Division I-A or I-AA, but listed instead as unconfirmed. Institutions will be removed from that list as their data is received.

Any institution which cannot respond by September 1 will be placed in the subdivision for which it is qualified—if either—or in unclassified membership status. We will proceed as rapidly as possible and, therefore, need the cooperation of all of the membership in getting their data in.

This morning at the Division I round table, six institutions appealed to the members of the Division I-A for a waiver of that subdivision's I-A criteria. All six waiver requests were denied, so the only remaining determination to be made before we act is the attendance compilation.

You may be interested to know that the Council has directed the Classification Committee to conduct the same procedure regarding attendance in Division I-A each year, so any institution which failed to meet the attendance criteria will be identified as early in the following year as possible. In that regard, I believe that, in addition to the institutions reclassified this month, others probably will have difficulty meeting the scheduling requirement in 1982 and may be reclassified or unclassified following that season.

Concerning the legislative proposals, I have given you my opinion regarding additional divisions.

I recommend that you support No. 90, which the Classification Committee proposed to strengthen the Division I criteria. The committee believes allowing a college to count cross country, indoor track and outdoor track in meeting sponsorship requirements allows too much credit for essentially the same people and activity. No. 90 would allow cross country and one track activity to be counted.

Proposal No. 82 would amend the constitution to require, for NCAA membership, that a coed college sponsor four women's teams, with one in each sports season.

No. 87 would permit an institution to move its membership classification only to an adjacent division. Accordingly, a member of Division I could not move to Division III but only to II. It could move again after spending three years in II, of course.

**Secretary-Treasurer Toner:** Of course, one of the most important issues is football television. I hardly need to add more, but the subject has been on the front pages and the sports pages all through the year and promises to remain there for some time.

To address the NCAA television matter is Wiles Hallock, chair of the committee and executive director of the Pac-10 Conference.

**Wiles Hallock (Pacific-10 Conference):** It is poignantly ironic, I think, to return from the NCAA's finest hour to the sometimes sordid arena of controversy, particularly with the University of Texas at Austin playing such a prominent part in both instances. Events which were set into motion last Friday have changed my role here at the microphone.

Last Friday, in the district court of Travis County, Texas, the University of Texas at Austin, through Professor L. O. "Tom" Morgan, without notice to the defendants and giving no opportunity for the defendants to appear, obtained a temporary restraining order which was not served until approximately 9:30 this morning and about which there was no knowledge on the part of the defendants prior to that time.

The temporary restraining order restrains and enjoins the defendant NCAA; the defendant NCAA Council; James Frank, NCAA president; John L. Toner, NCAA secretary-treasurer; Walter Byers, executive director of the NCAA; the successor in office to each of them; the defendant NCAA Committee on Infractions; the offices, agents or employees of such defendants, and all others acting in concert with them from the following: one, submitting for action at the 76th annual Convention of the NCAA those items appearing as Proposals 45, 46 and 47 on the Official Notice of said Convention; two, submitting the subject matter of said proposals for action of the Convention or its members in any other form or manner whatsoever.

The officers of the NCAA, pending further clarification from the NCAA counsel, which has been called into action as you might suspect, have made the interpretation that, the way the restraining order reads, the subject matter of Items 45, 46 and 47 may not be discussed at this Convention.

There will be a hearing on the injunction on January 18. If there is further word from legal counsel of the NCAA relative to that matter, you will be informed.

**Secretary-Treasurer Toner:** It is very difficult to think what is next, and if we do adjourn this meeting this afternoon, I would like to alert the Council that the scheduled meeting will be moved up to 30 minutes after the adjournment. I would remind our members that any questions pertaining to the referenced matter in the temporary restraining order cannot be taken by Wiles or any other member of the committee, nor can it be discussed in formal session here at this Convention.

Is there anything else that the membership would like to discuss or question during the rest of this session? Then I might take the liberty of declaring this session adjourned and remind everyone that we are going to be in business tomorrow at 8 a.m.

[The session adjourned at 4 p.m.]



## BUSINESS SESSION

### Tuesday Morning, January 12, 1982

The business session of the 76th NCAA Convention was called to order in the Imperial Ballroom at 8 a.m. by NCAA President James Frank.

#### 4. ACCEPTANCE OF REPORTS

[Motions were made, seconded and approved to accept the reports of the sports and general committees, treasurer, Council and Executive Committee.]

#### 5. GENERAL REMARKS

**President Frank:** There is one announcement. The temporary restraining order filed by the University of Texas yesterday has been vacated, and we shall proceed with the agenda as it was mailed to the delegates.

#### 6. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

##### Consent Package—Constitution

**President Frank:** The first proposals to be considered are those contained in the consent package. Unless there is a motion to separate any of them, a motion is in order for Proposal Nos. 1 through 11.

**Joseph R. Geraud** (University of Wyoming): I move approval of Proposal Nos. 1 through 11.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal Nos. 1-11 (pages A-1-11) were approved.]

##### Consent Package—Bylaws

**Edwin D. Muto** (State University of New York, Buffalo): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal Nos. 12 through 31, offered as a consent package of amendments to the bylaws.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal Nos. 12-31 (pages A-11-21) were approved.]

##### Playing and Practice Seasons

**Judith R. Holland** (University of California, Los Angeles): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of No. 32.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment is consistent with the transition period allowed the women during the period from August 1981 through August 1985. It provides for exemptions from the provisions of Bylaw 3 except for the limitations on the number of contests, which we felt was consistent with the academic schedule of the universities and with the foreign-

tour restrictions.

[Proposal No. 32 (page A-21) was approved by all divisions.]

##### Basketball—Number of Contests

**C. Arnold Ferrin Jr.** (University of Utah): I move adoption of Proposal No. 33. With the continuance of inflation and with the experience of having seen those teams who have postseason tournaments being able to play 29 games, we would propose that we increase the number of games we are allowed to play to 29.

In our case, we would play schools that would be close to us. We would not take students out of school any more than they are, and it would help the budget restrictions that we now have.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 33 (page A-21) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

##### Basketball—Number of Contests

**Richard G. Shrider** (Miami University): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 34.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to permit Divisions I and II institutions to play one additional basketball game each year. The Council sponsored this amendment when it noted the calendar adjustments will permit additional weekends for regular-season basketball games in the future, and an additional game could be beneficial for many institutions where basketball is a revenue-producing sport.

In addition, when the new double-round-robin requirement for automatic qualification takes effect, an additional permissible game may be desirable in preserving some holiday tournaments.

**Carl C. James** (Big Eight Conference): Can I ask Mr. Shrider if this proposal has the backing of the board of directors of the basketball coaches association?

**Mr. Shrider:** I cannot answer that.

**President Frank:** Neither can I.

**Joseph R. Vancisin** (National Association of Basketball Coaches): This proposal does have the backing of the National Association of Basketball Coaches.

[Proposal No. 34 (pages A-21-22) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

##### Soccer Playing and Practice Seasons

**John B. Simpson** (Boston University): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 35, to allow four preseason scrimmages that would not count against the permissible number of soccer contests.

[The motion was seconded.]

Many schools bring their soccer athletes back for preseason practice. It is the feeling of some of the schools that this would reduce the number of athletes because they could play their scrimmages between other teams.

[Proposal No. 35 (page A-22) was defeated by all divisions.]

### Property Rights

**L. O. Morgan** (University of Texas, Austin): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the sponsors of Proposal No. 36, I move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move the adoption of Amendment No. 36-1 as it was circularized to you this morning.

[The motion was seconded.]

The amendment is simply a clarification of the wording in paragraphs (a) and (b) and, as such, it is basically an interpretation. It addresses the question of what we consider to be rightly defined as property rights and those things about which there was concern at the St. Louis meeting, which might in some instances be thought to be property rights. We thought it would be best to get those excluded and make it clear that we had no intention of covering those under the property rights amendment clause.

**Charley Scott** (University of Alabama): Mr. Chairman, my question to Dr. Morgan is, is it the intent that the two lists will be all-inclusive?

**Mr. Morgan:** No, they are meant to be separately.

**Joseph R. Geraud** (University of Wyoming): I rise to speak against the amendment for the simple reason that we do have proposals later in the program which directly address the questions pertaining to television. I see little purpose in introducing into our legislation a concept of property rights that is then defined to include only those matters which are otherwise directly addressed.

[Proposal No. 36-1 (page A-23) was defeated.]

**Keith Broman** (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Amendment No. 36-2.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 36-2 (pages A-23-24) was defeated.]

**President Frank:** Now, we will move to the original motion.

**Mr. Morgan:** I will not hesitate to discuss this. I think you will have judged this is a matter of rather deep principle to us, and that is the basis for our feelings about it. Objectively and as a practical matter, it appears to me, as a personal view, that the broadcasting TV plan worked out by the committee is actually a very good one and one we could accept and approve.

It is a question of how that approval is made and at what point it can be approved with regard to who controls the property rights. We do have a problem with state law, which I think you are all aware of, and a responsibility to our governing bodies that cannot delegate their fiscal authority to any outside body. We have a continuing concern for administrative control over individual institutions, which is implied in Proposal Nos. 45 and 47, especially those aspects which address the knotty matter of nonbroadcast TV.

**Harry C. Mallios** (University of Miami): The University of Miami also wishes, as a matter for the record, to affirm its position relative to control of property rights. The right to control the use of property

rights to broadcast, telecast, cablecast intercollegiate football contests, we feel, is the right of the University of Miami.

I have submitted to the chair this morning a letter from my chief executive officer, Everett B. Flood, which states our position. He states, "Although it does not seem necessary because this university's position has been communicated to the NCAA officials and their representatives in a variety of ways for months, I wish to confirm again that the NCAA is not authorized to represent the University of Miami in any negotiations for televising our football team or to make any contractual commitment on our behalf without appropriate written consent from us."

**Mr. Geraud:** I believe the delegates have heard this before, but the preceding speaker once again referred to the property rights amendment as being relevant and pertinent to the manner in which television is controlled. I merely submit to the Convention that, once again, the issue of television is directly addressed in the later proposals without becoming involved in the concept of what is a property right.

[Proposal No. 36 (pages A-22-23) was defeated.]

### NCAA Penalty Structure

**Henry T. Lowe** (University of Missouri, Columbia): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 37.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal responds to the concerns expressed by a number of influential persons, including coaches associated with this Association. Its intent is to grant an additional penalty to the structure of penalties that are now in place. It is a supplement and not a replacement of the existing penalty structure. The provision is quite simple in its statement that it would be the Infractions Committee that would have authority to assess a penalty, a substantial penalty, not to exceed \$50,000 in any single case for proceeding.

A question has been raised about the ability of some schools under state law to live by this penalty if it were imposed. The sponsors recognize that this will be a matter that the Infractions Committee would have to deal with on a case-by-case basis.

**Stephen Horn** (California State University, Long Beach): I would like to ask the sponsor some questions. It has been practiced, I know, in the late 1960s and a good part of the '70s that, when there are infractions committed, especially by institutions that have basketball, most of the net receipts of the postseason tournaments are recaptured when ineligible players involved in those infractions have participated in those games.

I wonder what the gentlemen would say about that as being the existing penalties which are levied by the NCAA, even though the NCAA for years seems to deny there are penalties. As I have mentioned before, years ago, I find it a penalty when you get a bill to return \$90,000 or \$100,000, or whatever it is, several weeks after the infractions.

It seems to me that in some recent cases such "penalties" have not been levied. I guess I worry a little bit about the discretion exhibited by the Committee on Infractions. I wonder if they would be the same when

they are levying \$50,000 fines. I would rather see either a firm set of penalties that goes with particular infractions or no penalties and simply go back to the net receipts approach.

I wonder if you could enlighten me on the philosophy behind this. **Mr. Lowe:** President Horn, I am not at all certain I can. The intent of this provision is not to change anything that now exists in the penalty structure. This is a supplement. I believe one of the principal reasons for putting a flexible provision like this into the enforcement structure is to take care of relatively minor cases where a private reprimand or perhaps even a public reprimand would ordinarily be imposed.

I think there is a general belief now among many people that the private reprimand means nothing and that there ought to be added some flexibility in the Association's legislation to permit, in relatively minor cases, a financial penalty to be imposed. I think it would be very difficult, indeed impossible, to fix a penalty that would apply to every case.

There is no way that any of us have devised yet where we can take an individual case and set a fixed penalty for that ahead of time. They have to be judged individually. That is the way this provision reads; and it is a flexible provision, not to exceed in any given case \$50,000.

**Mr. Horn:** Well, personally, Mr. Chairman, I am very sympathetic with the idea; but I am not sympathetic with what I see in the administration of so-called nonpenalties. I do think that for many institutions that are bringing in hundreds of thousands of dollars in these programs, if not millions, this would be regarded as simply a cost of doing business and a cost of operations.

That is what bothers me about the \$50,000, not to mention the legal problems that some of the state institutions have or the terrific burden this would be on small institutions that do not have the hundreds of thousands pouring through the doors from television and everything else. But it is the administration that concerns me rather than the thought.

[Proposal No. 37 (page A-24) was defeated.]

#### **Postseason Football**

**Gwendolyn Norrell** (Michigan State University): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 38.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal ensures that the earliest possible date for a bowl commitment would be November 19. The Council agreed to sponsor the Postseason Football Committee's recommendations to provide that the commitment date fall consistently in the November 24 period. Under the present language, the commitment date could be as early as November 15.

I just note that the NCAA Public Relations Committee has recommended that the Bylaw 2 commitment date legislation be deleted from the Manual because of the abuses by institution and bowl representatives. The Council will review this legislation and the Public Relations

Committee's recommendation in 1982.

**Don Bryant** (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): Mr. Chairman, as an explanation to the delegates, the committee unanimously voted to eliminate this bylaw on the basis of its impracticality and the unenforceability. Mr. Wright, chair of the Infractions Committee, publicly—that is, in a press conference on Saturday—voiced strong support.

Perhaps the best example of the problem this creates for us occurred at the University of Nebraska. This past fall, Nebraska qualified automatically for the Orange Bowl bid a week early and on the subsequent Monday received over 4,000 ticket requests from an opponent which had not been contacted and would not be invited until one week later. It created quite a problem.

**Milo R. Lude** (University of Washington): Mr. Chairman, I am speaking for the Postseason Football Committee. This is just a clarification of the date. This is not about either accepting or denying the present legislation. It is clarification and it is a very important needed date, so that we don't have selection on the 15th of November.

I want to bring to the attention of the Convention that we are not voting whether or not to delete this from our rules and regulations; it is just a clarification.

[Proposal No. 38 (pages A-24-25) was approved by all divisions.]

#### **Coaches' Contracts**

**Richard G. Shrider** (Miami University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 39.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is under Recommended Policies and would amend Policy 7 by adding a new Section 4 and renumbering the subsequent sections. The intent is to encourage members to include in coaches' contracts a provision that a coach's employment may be terminated if the coach involved is in violation of the NCAA legislation.

[Proposal No. 39 (page A-25) was approved.]

#### **Football Coaching Staff**

**James I. Robertson** (Virginia Polytechnic Institute): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 40.

[The motion was seconded.]

Item No. 40 is simply intended to stop the proliferation and the variety in the amount of part-time coaches. This proposal would eliminate the need for athletic departments to secure outside employment for part-time assistants, and certainly it would be more economical to employ one additional full-time assistant than to be involved in a veritable covey of part-time assistants.

Lastly, the rule would seem to make it perfectly clear who is and who is not a full-time coach; and we would stipulate that you would have nine full-time coaches, two part-time coaches. Both of the part-time coaches would have to be bona fide students in graduate school. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Association will support this proposal.

**Andrew T. Mooradian** (University of New Hampshire): Mr. Chair-

man, I would like to urge the Division I-AA members to vote this amendment down, not on the merits of whether it be eight or nine; but we do have many schools coming down into I-AA and they will not have a chance to vote on this. I would rather see I-AA consider this at the next Convention. So I urge them to vote "no."

**Robert M. Sweazy** (Texas Tech University): Mr. President, I would like to urge all Division I-A members to vote for this. This is an opportunity to eliminate probably the biggest inequity that exists in Division I-A Football right now. For some reason or another, it has been defeated at previous Conventions, mainly for economic reasons; but, as pointed out by the introducer, that is not a valid reason.

I am aware that some Division I-AA schools may not have programs and, therefore, could not have part-time assistants. They should do as they feel. I would urge the I-A members to support this legislation.

**Seaver Peters** (Dartmouth University): Mr. President, this becomes kind of an annual debate. I would point out to the Convention that it is not so much an economic issue as it is an issue relating to qualified coaching for teams. In our particular league, the Ivy Group, we have three and four intercollegiate football teams: varsity, junior varsity, freshmen and, in some cases, a lightweight football program. While we have some sympathy for some of those that see the need to expand the number of full-time coaches, our concern is with paragraph (g), which eliminates two part-time coaches as now permitted for each bona fide team which schedules four intercollegiate contests.

The result of this would be to force us to eliminate one coach, and I think would result in less-than-adequate coaching for some of our other intercollegiate football teams. Again, to just ride in on Andy Mooradian's coat tails, his idea is a good one. Also, the I-AA membership will almost double; and yet the members who will join that division concept do not have a vote in I-AA. We do urge defeat of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 40 (pages A-25-26) was approved by Division I-A, 68-66, and defeated by Division I-AA. A subsequent motion to reconsider passed, 70-68; and Division I-A then defeated Proposal No. 40, 64-71 (see page 87).]

#### Scouting Limitations

**John B. Simpson** (Boston University): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 41.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chairman, this will make scouting in soccer consistent with scouting in football; and we move its adoption.

[Proposal No. 41 (page A-26) was defeated by Division I.]

#### Satisfactory Progress

**Robert F. Steidel Jr.** (University of California, Berkeley): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of No. 42.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is intended to affirm that the satisfactory-progress rule applies

to eligibility for regular-season competition for the Division II membership as well as for championship competition. This was the intent of the legislation adopted by the 1981 Convention, but the language adopted was not amended at that time to conform to the intent of the legislation.

Item B of the amendment requires a student-athlete at a Division I or II institution to demonstrate satisfactory progress after the athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in a sport, regardless of whether he actually completed the full academic year. The amendment also substitutes the words "acceptable toward" a baccalaureate degree for "required for" a baccalaureate degree. This makes the first alternative under subparagraph (ii) conform to the language of the second alternative.

Further, in demonstrating satisfactory progress under the first alternative, the student-athlete must show satisfactory completion of an average of 12 hours per term for each of the academic terms in an academic year in which the student is enrolled in a term or terms. This is intended to discourage the student from enrolling only during the terms in which the competition in the student's sport is conducted.

Speaking for the Academic Testing and Requirements Committee, which recommended this legislation, this plugs a hole in the progress rule as it now reads. As it is now written, it is not a progress rule at all; and this corrects the faulty rule. I recommend adoption of the proposal.

**William M. Sangster** (Georgia Institute of Technology): Mr. President, I am quite in agreement with the points brought forth by Mr. Steidel. I am somewhat concerned by the change in the last paragraph from "required for" to "acceptable toward." I wonder if we can have some interpretation of what "acceptable toward" means. Does this mean acceptable toward a specific degree program or acceptable toward any degree program that the institution may have?

If it is the latter interpretation, we have essentially emasculated the whole satisfactory-progress concept.

**Mr. Steidel:** Speaking again for the Academic Testing and Requirements Committee, to which this question would probably be referred, I rather suspect, Bill, that it is the latter definition. That is, we don't want to have a situation that, of course, changes its acceptability with a change in the degree objective, so if the student goes for one degree, the course is accepted, and if the student goes for another degree, the course is not accepted. What we are talking about is that the acceptability is determined by whether the school will accept it for any of its degree programs.

**Robert F. Ray** (University of Iowa): Mr. President, I favor this legislation in principle, but I am concerned about the possibility of the awarding of relief in the event of serious illness or injury which would make it impossible for the student to meet the requirements.

Currently, our conference has a rule similar to this, and we do allow the award of relief in the event the student cannot simply meet the requirement by virtue of those conditions. I would like to ask if it is intended that the administration of this rule be left to the member conferences or whether or not there will be some stipulation or



standards made by the Eligibility Committee or the Academic Testing and Requirements Committee through which relief may be awarded by the conference.

**Mr. Steidel:** Mr. President, I can't answer that one because, although I have heard it stated that questions about this progress rule will be referred to the Academic Testing and Requirements Committee, I have not seen that in writing or had it specifically stated to me in that way. I suspect that is what will happen.

**Mr. Ray:** Mr. President, last year we passed a rule at the Convention and it was agreed that the NCAA would provide the conferences with certain standards through which relief could be awarded; and, as far as I know, they are yet forthcoming. I have not yet seen them. I am concerned about whether or not this is going to leave certain students in a deep hole, and we can't help them.

**Joseph R. Geraud** (University of Wyoming): I would reaffirm some of the comments I made yesterday at the round table. The NCAA Council is aware of the fact that this relatively new legislation was basically adopted only one year ago. There are questions concerning how exceptions can be administered. The delegates are aware of the fact, I am sure, that the basic legislation does give the Academic Testing and Requirements Committee authority to make exceptions and to issue waivers in particular situations.

The Council is directing a communication to the committee that, in the Council's judgment, it does have the authority to review the progress rules of conferences, which are administered by the conferences, and that the committee could except from the NCAA standards certain minor variations so long as it finds that the conference rule is as demanding or more demanding than the purposes stated in the standards of the NCAA rule.

I realize this is complex; but I think it is our view that, insofar as possible, conferences should be in a position to receive a waiver after a review by the committee of the various aspects that may not be considered initially in full compliance. If the totality meets it, we hope the committee would so act.

**James L. McCullough** (Gulf South Conference): I have a question, please, on No. 42, Part A. Is that requiring the same thing as No. 93 for regular-season competition for Division II?

**President Frank:** No, it does not require the same thing.

[Part A of Proposal No. 42 (pages A-26-27) was approved by Division II, and Part B was approved by Divisions I and II.]

#### **Satisfactory Progress**

**Keith Broman** (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 43.

[The motion was seconded.]

**President Frank:** Let me make a comment first. In No. 43, the portion that deletes the third through the seventh lines of No. 43 is moot, because of the adoption of No. 42-B.

**Mr. Broman:** The intent of this legislation is to supply a require-

ment for obtaining grade-point averages based on satisfactory progress. It has worked well for a number of years. I urge its adoption.

[Proposal No. 43 (pages A-27-28) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

[Proposal No. 44 (pages A-28-29) was withdrawn.]

**President Frank:** I have been asked to remind you that the satisfactory progress legislation applies only to student-athletes first entering the institution after August 1, 1981.

#### **Football Coaching Staff**

**R. J. Snow** (University of Utah): Mr. Chairman, having voted on the prevailing side, I wonder if it is in order to move for reconsideration of Proposal No. 40?

**President Frank:** Yes.

**Mr. Snow:** If so, I would so move.

**President Frank:** Division I-A or I-AA?

**Mr. Snow:** Division I-A.

[The motion was seconded.]

In view of the extremely close vote on this matter and its defeat in Division I-AA, I think it is a matter that requires additional consideration on the individual campuses and might be put up for reconsideration next year. I do move careful thought on this and would appreciate reconsideration by the Convention.

[The motion to reconsider was approved, 70-68.]

[Proposal No. 40 (pages A-25-26) was defeated by Division I-A, 64-71.]

#### **Football Television**

**John W. Sawyer** (Wake Forest University): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of No. 45.

[The motion was seconded.]

Yesterday, we were prohibited from discussing this at the panel discussion, so I would like to just say a word or two further about it. This particular proposal is unique in this agenda. It is the only official interpretation being acted upon. To refresh your memory there, the Council can issue interpretations on existing legislation; and any member may challenge such interpretation, whereupon the next Convention votes to either approve or reject this interpretation.

Inasmuch as one or more institutions called for a review of the interpretation, it was placed on the agenda for action to vote either to approve or disapprove this interpretation. Now, the question comes up, is the interpretation valid? That is, is it based upon legislation, the intent of the legislation and the general understanding and history of what that legislation means?

I think it would be well to go back, for a moment, all the way to 1952. In the 1952 Convention, there were three items adopted as a package. First of all, Constitution 2-1-(h), under the Purposes of NCAA, empowered or gave as one of the purposes of the NCAA, "To legislate,

through bylaws or by resolution of a Convention, upon any subject of general concern to the members in the administration of intercollegiate athletics . . . .” Secondly, Constitution 6-4 allows for resolutions and voting by mail and then, after that, the resolution authorizing a television committee, for the first time, to determine a TV plan subject to approval by mail.

Thereupon, in subsequent years the Convention each year would adopt a resolution authorizing the mail vote on the TV plan to be formulated by the Television Committee.

In 1961, they went to a two-year plan, so the resolutions were adopted only each two years. Now, what did these resolutions say? I happen to have one of these early resolutions, in particular the 1955 resolution. I will not read the entire thing, but there are two statements which are important to this interpretation.

One, “Be it further resolved that the 1956 Television Committee shall continue to study the present and potential effects of delayed-subscription and closed-circuit television upon college football and shall have authority to include in the 1956 Television Plan such provisions with respect thereto, if any, as it deems necessary to prevent adverse effect on college football.”

Then secondly, “Be it further resolved, that no member institution of that NCAA shall make or extend any commitments, arrangements or contracts for any form of television of college football games until the adoption of the approved plan and then only for the 1956 season, and then in conformity with the provisions of that plan.”

Now, that same wording was adopted by 14 separate Conventions. In 1971, the constitution and bylaws were revised and adopted by the Convention, and, for the first time, gave all general committees specific powers and duties. Particularly, the Football Television Committee was authorized to come up with a TV package to be approved by a mail vote.

So with all of this previous history of approving what is in this interpretation, we think the interpretation is valid in every respect; and we ask you to support it.

[Proposal No. 45 (page A-29) was approved.]

#### **Resolution: Football Television**

**Andrew T. Mooradian** (University of New Hampshire): I move adoption of Resolution No. 46.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 46 is a product of an unusual year in television affairs of the Association, with many comments in the media about how the programs were conducted, often based upon passion or erroneous information. Some said the Association lacked authority to adopt television principles and plans. Some said conducting the two mail votes on principles was not authorized. The very accuracy of the counting of the votes was questioned.

In such an atmosphere, the Council believes, it is important to afford the membership an opportunity to reaffirm its understanding that the

actions taken with respect to the principles of the Association and television contracts for 1982-1985 were proper and fully authorized by the membership in each instance.

Even with the adoption of No. 45, without passage of No. 46, it could be argued that the O.I. that we have, while the O.I. is now properly adopted, was not valid when issued. So I would move the adoption of No. 46.

[Resolution No. 46 (pages A-29-30) was approved.]

#### **Football Television**

**Wiles Hallock** (Pacific-10 Conference): Mr. President, speaking in behalf of the NCAA Television Committee and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 47.

[The motion was seconded.]

**John O. Bolvin** (University of Pittsburgh): Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment to the amendment, No. 47-1.

**President Frank**: Are we talking about Part A?

**Mr. Bolvin**: Right.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of the amendment to the amendment is to limit the controls of the NCAA in the television deals with the most common forms of TV as they now exist. It is our feeling, at the University of Pittsburgh, that the fields of pay TV and subscription TV are still in formative stages.

Because of this, we believe that the best way to determine the potential use of pay and subscription TV is to let each institution and each conference experiment and try out different means of utilizing these forms of TV. All of us involved in discussions of higher education recognize that one of the best ways of determining the potential of new technology is to give institutions the freedom of experimenting with this technology and arriving at different kinds of applications.

It is, therefore, our belief that the amendment to the amendment should be approved.

**Mr. Hallock**: I would like to speak against the amendment to the amendment. It seems to me, first of all, that the language could very well not be pertinent or applicable by 1986, including subscription television as an exception, but not cablecasting. It could very well be that by 1986 pay-for-view could be dominated by cablecasting rather than subscription TV or some other form.

So I am not sure that the sponsors really want to make an exception for a particular form of telecasting now which might not be pertinent by 1986.

Secondly, I would like to speak on the subject of control for a moment. It seems to me that the concept that has been advanced—that one form of over-the-air television can be controlled and another form decontrolled without damage to the ratings or the ability to achieve revenue or to in-stadium attendance—is fallacious. If a viewer is receiving a signal for a competitive game in his home, it doesn't matter how it was delivered there. Decontrol of one form of TV is really

tantamount to decontrol totally of live television.

I think it would be very harmful to the collective-bargaining position that the NCAA has now in controlling all forms of television. The concept that there can be control of one delivery system to the TV set in your home and not another is about like saying that you can be slightly pregnant.

**Mr. Bolvin:** Just for the reasons that the previous speaker mentioned, its lack of definition, this whole field of technology that we are moving into is undefined; and to say that the NCAA or any institution should control all forms is senseless, from our point of view. We feel that there is some good work being done now with the cablecasting, the supplemental contracts.

We don't intend to interfere with those; but we do feel that we, as institutions, need some freedom on this television until we define and find out what can happen.

**Mr. Hallock:** Mr. President, with respect to that, I would respectfully submit that the provisions of No. 47, unamended, which we feel provide the greatest kind of input from the members of the NCAA and, particularly, input from each division, might very well in the next three or four years result in a plan approved by the majority of the members of a particular division which might wish to modify beyond 1986 what controls mean.

By adopting No. 47 as is, you are certainly not foreclosing the option of moving with the developments in television; and, if it is apparent that some form of television should be excluded, that could be a part of the next plan.

**President Frank:** I will now call for the vote on No. 47-1, Part A. [Part A of Proposal No. 47-1 (page A-32) was defeated.]

[Part A of Proposal No. 47 (pages A-30-31) was approved.]

**Mr. Bolvin:** Are we on the amendment to the amendment, or do you want to go to the amendment?

**President Frank:** We are on No. 47-B now, the original amendment.

**Mr. Hallock:** I move, in behalf of the NCAA Council, the adoption of No. 47-B.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Mr. Bolvin:** I again, for the same reason, move the adoption of No. 47-1-B, as an amendment to the amendment.

[Part B of Proposal No. 47-1 (page A-32) was defeated by all divisions.]

[Part B of Proposal No. 47 (pages A-30-31) was approved by all divisions.]

**Mr. Hallock:** I would move the adoption of No. 47-C.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Kenneth G. Germann** (Southern Conference): Mr. President, would you announce the withdrawal, as I mentioned to you previously, of No. 48?

**President Frank:** Yes, No. 48 has been withdrawn. We are now on No. 47-C.

[Part C of Proposal No. 47 (pages A-30-31) was approved by all divisions.]

### **Resolution: Football Television**

**Wiles Hallock** (Pacific-10 Conference): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 47-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 47-2 is the resolution sponsored by the NCAA Council that commits the Council to submit as legislation in 1983 an amendment that would provide that, under the terms of No. 47-B, Section 2, any future television plan developed for Division I must be approved by a majority of I-A members in addition to the majority of the entire division.

I think it would assure, and perhaps put to rest the concerns of, Division I-A members that Division I-AA could prevail in the development of the Division I plan.

[Resolution No. 47-2 (page A-32) was approved.]

[Proposal No. 48 (pages A-32-33) was withdrawn.]

### **NCAA Penalty Structure**

**Andrew T. Mooradian** (University of New Hampshire): Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 49.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Charley Scott** (University of Alabama): Most of you heard me raise a question yesterday about any discretion on this item. The proposal concerns me, and I wish to tell you something about it. It provides the Committee on Infractions with the authority to impose penalties in areas in which the NCAA has no programs.

In the words of another delegate, the NCAA will be permitted to take away what it cannot give. I question the providing of such authority. It is said that we already grant such authority in other areas. I have not sorted out that rationale in my own thinking; but I do question if the existence of another wrong, at least as far as I see it, can be justification for adding another.

It is also said that unfair penalties by comparison result in current practices. To me, the point of penalties should be to disadvantage the errant institution. The levels of disadvantage can be comparable without the existence of precisely the same penalties. It is also said that the Committee on Infractions believes it can use this penalty already without the passage of this proposal.

Reading the enforcement procedure, that probably is correct. However, by defeating this proposal I think you will send a clear signal to the Committee on Infractions that such a penalty is not acceptable to the membership. I believe you should send that signal.

**Stephen Horn** (California State University, Long Beach): I would be interested in the Council's definition of what is "live coverage." Is a one-minute tape delay live coverage? Is a half-hour tape delay live coverage? What is the definition of that?

**Mr. Hallock:** I would only speculate that one minute of live

coverage would not be considered live coverage. There is a principle of live television coverage on news sports telecasts which runs to a limit of two minutes running time, I believe, which is acceptable over and above any control on live coverage. I would assume that perhaps anything over two minutes, which would not be the definition of restrictions on live coverage, might also apply here, but certainly not one minute of time.

**Mr. Horn:** Well, I want to be very clear, Wiles. Are we talking about two minutes, then, being the borderline, five minutes?

**Mr. Hallock:** I would think that two minutes would be the dividing line.

**Mr. Horn:** Well, I would say that you could then drive a truck right through the middle of this language, because that is a very simple subterfuge to get around. Maybe I am not being clear, Wiles. But let's say, to get around this, the simple way would be to merely have a delay in transmission of taping it and then running it two minutes after the actual event is occurring. Would that qualify?

**Mr. Hallock:** No, we are not talking about delayed coverage; we are talking about live coverage.

**Mr. Horn:** Well, it just seems to me that delayed coverage of only two minutes is a way to have almost live coverage. That is the point.

**President Frank:** We might have one other answer in a moment.

**Mr. Hallock:** Under the current TV Plan, delayed telecasts could not occur prior to 10:30 p.m. local time. There is a consideration, as a matter of renegotiation with ABC and CBS, to move that delayed period from 10:30 to 10 p.m. local time. But I would say that the same restriction that is on the delayed television under the TV Plan would apply to this.

**Homer C. Rice** (Georgia Institute of Technology): Are we talking about football or are we talking about all sports? If we are talking about delayed television after 10:30, you don't have the control in the other sports, particularly basketball. Could that be clarified?

**President Frank:** I think that was the point Mr. Scott was raising, that we are talking about all sports.

**Wayne Duke** (Big Ten Conference): Mr. President, I think we all recognize the concerns relative to the NCAA moving into an area which relates to conference or institutional television programming. Even though recognizing those concerns, it is my view that this is a good piece of legislation. Having served as the chair of the NCAA Basketball Committee for the past several years and having served as a member of the Collegiate Commissioners' Association liaison with the National Association of Basketball Coaches board of directors, it is my view that this legislation would serve the interests of collegiate basketball.

Obviously, it is left to the discretion of the Committee on Infractions to impose any actions of this sort. In my view, some of the college basketball telecasts which we will see in the next few weeks will not have institutions on probation if this were invoked.

[Proposal No. 49 (page A-33) was approved.]

### Student-Athlete Employment

**G. Jean Cerra** (University of Missouri, Columbia): Mr. President, on behalf of the Special Committee on Legislative Review and the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 50.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is one of the proposals developed by the Special Committee on Legislative Review in its attempt to move toward common rules for men and women. The matter of coaching or teaching in one sport represents a major difference in existing rules for men and women.

No. 50 is something of a compromise between the stringent rules that now govern men and the much more liberal rules that women are accustomed to in this regard. The committee believes this flexibility is necessary, especially for women, in view of the need and commitment of the NCAA to encourage the development of more female coaches and officials.

Being able to gain experience in teaching and coaching one sport should definitely assist in that regard. We do not think that this proposal is too flexible inasmuch as the student-athlete would not be allowed to teach or coach at his or her own institution, except in summer camps, as stated in the proposal. The teaching or coaching cannot be arranged by the institution or a representative of the athletic interests, and the prohibition against compensation on a fee-for-lesson basis is still retained. Further, we believe this change would benefit both male and female student-athletes.

[Proposal No. 50 (pages A-33-34) was approved.]

### Complimentary Tickets

**Charley Scott** (University of Alabama): Mr. President, representing the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 51.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to permit, and I emphasize the word "permit," a student-athlete to sell complimentary tickets at face value, and I emphasize "face value," so long as they are not sold to the student-athlete's institution. Two years ago such action was possible. When the permission was removed, some responsible student-athletes on the Long Range Planning Committee expressed consternation and great concern.

The football and basketball coaches that work with the Recruiting Committee recommended that this permissive legislation be returned. This is a significant group of football and basketball coaches that are brought together each summer to work with the members of the Recruiting Committee.

On the basis of that recommendation, the members of the Recruiting Committee recommended support for this proposal to the Council. Likewise, the members of the Council have now recommended support of the proposal to you, the Convention.

I am reminded of a similar situation several years ago. There was a prohibition against a student being registered in a graduate school



program and continuing eligibility. I listened to those arguments and saw the proposals defeated several times. I pointed out at one meeting that, if there were those in the audience who could not find the way around that rule legitimately, then I, as a dean of a graduate school, could show them. One member of this Convention came to me afterwards and said, "For 10 years we have been trying to remove that restriction." It was removed at that time.

The same thing exists here. If you don't know how to get around this rule legitimately, see me after the meeting.

**Robert W. Sankey** (University of Arizona): Mr. President, I speak at the direction of the Pac-10 presidents and chancellors, who have asked that I urge the Convention to defeat this proposal. In reference to Charley Scott's comments just now, I further indicate that in the subsequent Convention, 1983, the members of our conference have asked to submit legislation that will move from a complimentary-ticket concept to a complimentary-admissions concept.

It is the view of the presidents and chancellors that this amendment mixes the legitimate need for complimentary admissions with the questionable manner of providing financial assistance and that that financial assistance is available inconsistently to the student-athlete only if that person is able to sell the tickets. I urge that this Convention defeat the amendment, which would make a more reasonable move toward further reduction of the complimentary tickets that would be available for sale and moving toward a complimentary-admissions concept.

[Proposal No. 51 (page A-34) was defeated.]

#### **Permissible Expenses**

**R. Bruce Allison** (Colorado School of Mines): Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of Proposal No. 52.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, it is my understanding, after sitting in on the Division II round table yesterday, that the Council is opposed to this motion and the basis, as I understand it, is that it would incur an additional expense upon the institutions involved. I would submit that this legislation is an enabling legislation that is permissive legislation; and it would, therefore, allow those institutions that desire to do so to pay the full, necessary expenses.

I further understand the Extra Events Committee is opposed to this proposed legislation, and I have heard two arguments against it. One is the so-called double-dip rule, which would allow a bowl game to pay actual and necessary expenses, and the institution could likewise do so. I would only submit to the membership that, once expenses have been paid from whatever source, they would no longer be actual and necessary.

Secondly, it is my understanding that the Extra Events Committee is opposed on the basis that a bowl game should be neither self-sustaining nor self-destructive. The United States Intercollegiate Lacrosse Association has conducted an all-star contest for five decades. At our recently concluded meetings in Cherry Hill, New Jersey, our member-

ship, composed of some 160 NCAA Division II member institutions, reviewed this proposed legislation; and not one dissenting vote was heard.

**Clarence E. Gaines** (Winston-Salem State University): In the third line in the wording of the proposal, it should be an NCAA-approved all-star contest, which is not included also.

**Olav B. Kollevoll** (Lafayette College): For all the reasons that Mr. Allison stated, the Council urges defeat of this proposal. It would put a financial burden on many institutions; and, in addition, the Council feels strongly that it is the responsibility of the sponsors of all-star contests to generate sufficient income so that they could take care of all of the necessary, actual and transportation expenses.

[Proposal No. 52 (pages A-34-35) was defeated.]

#### **Awards--Special Events**

**Milo R. Lude** (University of Washington): Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 53.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is clear. Inflation is here. Approve it.

[Proposal No. 53 (page A-35) was approved.]

**President Frank**: I would like to acknowledge the presence of Mr. Alan Evans, who is the secretary of the Universities Athletic Union. This is a counterpart to the NCAA in England. He is a visitor with us today, and we would like to extend a welcome to him. (Applause)

#### **Five-Year Rule**

**Edwin W. Lawrence** (Cheyney State College): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council and the Divisions II and III Steering Committees, I move adoption of Proposal No. 54.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to replace the five-calendar-year limitation on eligibility rule in Divisions II and III with the five-year residency limitation. This obviously is the culmination of several years of intense effort by Divisions II and III members to change the existing five-year rule.

Last year, finally, the membership moved the basic rule from the constitution to the bylaws, where each division can decide on its own eligibility limitation based on its own needs and problems.

**John A. Hogan** (Colorado School of Mines): The effort to provide our students with relief from the five-year rule was begun, as I remember, at the 1975 Convention in Washington, D.C. The struggle has been long and hard. Today we have the opportunity to complete the job. The time has come for us to emancipate our students. I urge your support of No. 54.

[Proposal No. 54 (pages A-35-36) was approved by Divisions II and III.]

#### **Seasons of Competition**

**Francis W. Bonner** (Furman University): Because No. 56 in your

program and paragraph A of No. 55 are identical except for the very important factor of the date upon which they would become effective, and because that is a matter of concern for the Council and the sponsors of No. 56, I would move a change in the order of business so that No. 56 could be considered before we get to No. 55.

[The motion to reorder was seconded and approved.]  
I would like to move the adoption of No. 56.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think it is clear that this amendment would permit a student-athlete at a Division I institution to participate in four seasons of competition and still remain eligible for postseason competition. The freshman year would not automatically be counted as one of the four as it presently does.

This, of course, would provide more flexibility for the student-athlete in using his permissible seasons of eligibility. So a student who, for athletic or academic reasons, elected not to participate as a freshman would still be eligible to participate for four years. Now, it should be noted that similar legislation was adopted at the 1978 Convention, but legislation was adopted at the 1979 Convention to restore the present language of the rule.

The Council's concern is that the effectiveness of the 2,000 rule is eroded somewhat by this proposal. Under the current rule, a non-qualifier cannot participate as a freshman in Division I, so he would have only three seasons of competition available to him. However, there is concern that the present rule causes some students to enroll in junior colleges where they can compete immediately. That may not be the most desirable result academically, but the various committees that have urged this proposal believe that the flexibility provided to the student outweighs the other considerations.

[Proposal No. 56 (page A-37) was approved by Division I.]

#### **Eligibility--Freshmen**

[Part A of Proposal No. 55 (pages A-36-37) became moot due to the adoption of Proposal No. 56.]

**Jack Friedenthal** (Stanford University): Mr. President, I move the adoption of No. 55, Parts B and C.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Robert F. Steidel Jr.** (University of California, Berkeley): Mr. President, I move adoption of the amendment to the amendment, No. 55-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation comes from the Pacific-10 Conference. We have a great concern over the eligibility of freshmen and, stemming from a study performed at the University of California, we found that there really are three kinds of student-athletes. There are the ones who really should stay around for the first year and not compete in athletics and get oriented to the campus. The transition from where they were to where they are going is too much, and they would benefit greatly from an additional year before competition sets in.

Then there are those who would probably graduate from the university without any trouble at all, and we really think it is not proper to have them held out from competition during the first year. Then there is the third group, which is in between.

We have thought about this; and proposed last year a rule, which is repeated again this year as the 2,750 legislation. At my own institution, the chances of a person graduating with a 3,000 grade point coming into the University of California at Berkeley is about two to one. For those who come in with a grade-point average of 2,500 from high school, the chances of graduating are about two to one against you. At 2,750, it is about 1.1 to-one against you; and we figured that was a reasonable percentage. The original legislation was written as 2,750. We have since then reconsidered and figured that 2,500 is a reasonable breaking point, and it would be more politic to suggest 2,500 rather than 2,750.

That is the reason for the amendment.

[Proposal No. 55-1 (page A-37) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

**Mr. Friedenthal:** Mr. President, I hope that all of you will bear with me while I talk a little bit about students and the fact that they go to school and that everything we do here does not deal with finances and money. It is important to recognize that we have a strong obligation to the students whether they are athletes or not. I find that a rule that says a player that is an athlete, a student-athlete, who does not have a high school average of 2,750 ought not to play the freshman year.

What we have done by passing No. 56 here is allow that person to come to school, spend a year, be supported and at the same time not lose any eligibility whatsoever. That seems to me to be the ideal situation. People who attend college, get a year under their belt, will not only be better students but they will be better athletes because they will not have to worry so much about the academic process.

Note this is a very, very limited proposal. We have a proposal, I think it is No. 57, on the book by a number of institutions, that want to raise the basic eligibility to 2,000. That would keep those people out from even having any financial support. They would have to go to a junior college if they wished to play. This is one modest proposal to vote for, to allow people to come to school, to get this one past them and perhaps even to go ahead and graduate.

It is not just graduation that is important. I think it is very important to recognize it is the quality of the educational process that we are talking about here. There is something, you know, about having a decent education, as well as just one that you managed to scrape by on all along. I urge the Convention to vote for this. I think it is important.

**G. B. Wyness** (West Coast Athletic Conference): Mr. President, I speak in opposition to this from several sources. My first source is that it depends on where the student comes from as to what that GPA means. The second is that we are not talking about only athletic endeavors that require considerable time, the major sports, but a lot of students that may want to participate in something like perhaps cross country, which is about the same as a normal workout that someone would like to have each day.

So I would urge you not to support this legislation. Give the student the right to participate if the student wishes to participate and allow the institution, if it has these desires, to impose a rule of intention.

**Edward M. Bennett** (Washington State University): I would like to take issue with at least one statement the previous speaker made. A testing service has done a survey that illustrates that 2,750 is the break-even point, beyond which students on a national level will succeed 50 percent of the time and 50 percent of the time they will not.

If you are talking about student-athletes, with that additional pressure on them, I think it is incumbent upon us to consider those individuals who are going to need that laying-out period at the beginning to become academically adjusted. I urge you to vote for the legislation.

[Parts B and C of Proposal No. 55 (pages A-36-37) were defeated by Divisions I and II.]

#### **Eligibility--2,000 Rule**

**William H. Baughn** (University of Colorado): Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of Proposal No. 57.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Joseph B. Tyson** (Southern Methodist University): We are in favor of Proposal No. 57; but we would like to defer the implementation date to August 1, 1983, since people have already begun to recruit, I think, on another basis. Therefore, I would move adoption of Amendment No. 57-1.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 57-1 (page A-38) was approved by Division I.]

**Mr. Baughn:** Mr. Chairman, the intent is obvious. This is to take a very small step towards raising the academic requirements for intercollegiate athletic programs at Division I institutions.

[Proposal No. 57 (pages A-37-38) was defeated by Division I, 91-180, as amended by Proposal No. 57-1.]

#### **Eligibility--2,000 Rule**

**Fred Jacoby** (Mid-American Athletic Conference): Mr. President, I move adoption of No. 58.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of No. 58 is to prevent a nonqualifier, a high school student with a 1.990 or less, from qualifying by attending a prep school for one year and qualifying on the basis of one year of academic work at that school. I think it should be noted that the same student does not have the privilege of returning to his own high school to qualify by taking courses beyond the eighth semester, such as in summer schools or in a ninth term.

The primary abuse has been the active recruiting and signing to a National Letter of Intent of a prospective student, knowing full well he will not qualify, and then placing the prospect in the prep school to make him feel obligated to enroll at the institution that originally recruited him the following year.

One year ago, the Convention enacted legislation to eliminate the same abuse at junior colleges and required students to graduate. This legislation would close the prep school loophole with the same idea. I urge your support of No. 58.

[Proposal No. 58 (pages A-38-39) was approved by Division I.]

[Proposal No. 59 was withdrawn.]

[Proposal No. 60 was withdrawn but was brought back for consideration subsequently after objection by a delegate to the withdrawal (see page 100).]

#### **Transfer Rule--Waiver**

**John W. Sawyer** (Wake Forest University): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of No. 61.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 61 is intended to answer a criticism that comes up on infractions penalties when an institution is placed on probation with sanctions against postseason competition. The feeling is that many innocent athletes are penalized excessively. What this does is to allow a person who, because of a penalty, would never again be eligible for postseason competition.

To be able to transfer to another institution under very stringent conditions, he has to get approval first of the Infractions Committee and then finally to get approval of the Council.

[Proposal No. 61 (pages A-39-40) was approved by all divisions.]

#### **Transfer Rule--Nonrecruited Student-Athlete**

**Olav B. Kollevoll** (Lafayette College): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 62.

[The motion was seconded.]

The amendment pretty well speaks for itself. The Council believes that it is logical for a student-athlete to transfer and be immediately eligible if he or she wasn't recruited, hasn't received any athletic aid and hasn't participated or competed in college activities.

[Proposal No. 62 (page A-40) was approved by all divisions.]

#### **Transfer Rule--Discontinued Sport**

**Edward W. Malan** (Pomona-Pitzer Colleges): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 63.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, this proposal is intended to be a clarification of the existing Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(8). The new language makes it clear that the waiver of the transfer residence requirement applies only to the sport that was dropped or in which competition was not offered at the student-athlete's previous institution.

In addition, it makes clear that the student-athlete must have actually practiced or competed at his previous institution in that sport if he is transferring because the institution dropped the sport.

[Proposal No. 63 (pages A-40-41) was approved by all divisions.]

### **Transfer—Junior College**

**Patrick R. Damore** (State University of New York Athletic Conference): Mr. President, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 64.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to permit a junior college transfer student who has completed a specified minimum number of hours to be eligible at a Division III member institution one calendar year after transfer from a previous four-year institution without graduating from a junior college.

[Proposal No. 64 (page A-41) was approved by Division III.]

### **Transfer—Junior College**

**Patrick R. Damore** (State University of New York Athletic Conference): I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 65.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to provide an opportunity for immediate NCAA championship eligibility at a Division III member institution for a junior college transfer student who has not competed in that sport at all or has not competed for a period of one year at the junior college.

[Proposal No. 65 (pages A-41-42) was approved by Division III.]

### **Transfer Rule—Division III**

**William A. Marshall** (Franklin and Marshall College): Mr. President, I would like to move adoption of No. 66.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 66 speaks somewhat to a philosophical point. The current legislation allows for students in Division III schools to transfer and obtain a waiver to play immediately under certain conditions. There are certain limited number of times when, for some very legitimate reasons, students may transfer or want to transfer a second time.

The way the legislation currently reads, he or she may not obtain a waiver for that second transfer. This legislation would delete subparagraph (ii), making transfer eligibility automatic so you wouldn't have to ask for a waiver.

[Proposal No. 66 (page A-42) was defeated by Division III, 74-89.]

### **Hardship—Junior College**

**President Frank:** It has been brought to my attention that a delegate wanted No. 60 considered, and I announced rather quickly that Nos. 59 and 60 had been withdrawn. He did not get an opportunity to get to the microphone, so at this time he objects to the withdrawal of No. 60; and the person may make a motion on No. 60.

**Gail Fullerton** (San Jose State University): Mr. President, we would like to have No. 60 considered. The intent is to permit a student-athlete who has sustained an incapacitating injury or illness while in junior college and who meets the other requirements of Bylaw 5-1-(d)-(2) to be

considered for a hardship ruling in a Division I member institution.

**President Frank:** Will you move it, please?

**Ms. Fullerton:** Yes. I so move.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 60 (page A-39) was defeated by Division I.]

### **Transfer Rule—Division III**

**William A. Marshall** (Franklin and Marshall College): Mr. President, based upon the action or the vote on No. 66, I would move withdrawal of No. 67.

[Proposal No. 67 (pages A-42-43) was withdrawn.]

### **Financial Aid—Division II**

**Charles D. Lein** (University of South Dakota): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the adoption of Item No. 68.

[The motion was seconded.]

As you know, this proposal was suggested by the NCAA Council last year; and it was proposed at that time for Division II but expanded upon to include Division I. There was a great debate on the floor at that time, and it was close in Division I and not that close in Division II.

The proposal today is for Division II only. The intent basically is to redefine what constitutes a full-ride athletic scholarship. That includes any tuition, books and fees, the balance to be determined on the basis of need using national standards formulated by the U.S. Department of Education.

We have all experienced the impact of compounded double-digit inflation; we have responded to the demands of Title IX, and we have all found increased pressures, not only supporting intercollegiate athletics on our various campuses but supporting all of our activities and our educational roles.

I suggested to my colleagues at the Chicago meeting last fall that this proposal, or one similar to it, would pass either this year or at some time in the near future. Seventy percent of the Division II presidents at that meeting supported this proposal and urged that it be brought to the Convention for adoption.

It is my contention that dropping sports is not the answer to solving the concerns for economy. If and when we are in a position where we are supporting only the revenue sports, in my opinion we will be revolving into a posture where one could legitimately question the integrity of the role of intercollegiate athletics. I don't think any of us want to be in this posture. I urge your positive consideration of this proposal.

**Corey Van Fleet** (Oakland University): While we understand the intent, our institution has the concern that this legislation precludes academic scholarships won by individual students in competitive testing situations and other kinds of aid based on nonathletic standards, which we feel sincerely hampers the truly outstanding student-athlete such as we saw on the dais yesterday.

**Ade L. Sponberg** (North Dakota State University): I rise in opposition to No. 68. Allow me to make a couple of points. I believe



athletic grants-in-aid have created a uniform program. I believe that the full grant will permit a student-athlete to be a typical student. With the time demands on competitive athletes, without the grant, he would be atypical.

I predict this legislation will put us back in the jock service system. I also believe that the grant-in-aid has provided some equity between the areas of greater population density and those of lesser density. Finally, I believe that there will be a migration away from NCAA Division II football-playing and basketball-playing institutions if this legislation is passed. I urge its defeat.

**Asa N. Green** (Livingston University): In the interest of clarification, and we did discuss that point at the round-table discussion yesterday, I would point out that the proposal contemplates that there would be some exceptional circumstances, for example, academic scholarships that were run by competition. It does provide for an exception procedure and establishes a committee to approve those exceptions.

I would also have to concede, however, to Mr. Van Fleet that it would be a year or so before we would have the results of that process.

**Lewis Nobles** (Mississippi College): I rise to point out that, in the current status of the U.S. Office of Education programs, nobody in this room knows what the need-analysis form is going to show. There is no way in the world to compute it. You are dealing with an intangible; and, therefore, I would like to move to table this motion at this time.

**President Frank:** We will have to rule that out of order unless you intend to come back to this proposal today. Otherwise, you will have to move to postpone indefinitely.

**Mr. Nobles:** Let me simply move, then, as an amendment, to make the effective date at least one year later. Can that be done?

**President Frank:** That can't be done.

**Mr. Nobles:** I would then move to postpone indefinitely.

[The motion died for lack of a second.]

[Part A of Proposal No. 68 (pages A-43-44) was defeated by Division II. Part B became moot due to the defeat of Part A.]

#### Financial Aid Definition

**John P. Mahlstedt** (Iowa State University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 69.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment reintroduces the concept of recognizing the fact that student-athletes, like their student-body counterparts, do, in fact, have an identifiable cause associated with their educational experience that is not addressed in the aid package. This proposal applies a realistic inflation factor to the incidental allowance that was instituted by this Association some 13 years ago but was voted out in the name of budget cutting in the mid-1970s.

Today, in the era of new economic principles and at a time when block grants are a way of addressing an individual's needs, it would

appear prudent for this Association to approve this amendment, equitably fulfilling a basic need of all student-athletes participating in our intercollegiate athletic programs.

[Proposal No. 69 (pages A-44-45) was defeated.]

#### Financial Aid Definition

**John P. Mahlstedt** (Iowa State University): I would move adoption of Proposal No. 70.

[The motion was seconded.]

With the enthusiastic support indicated by the previous amendment (laughter) and the expression of a need to economize, this proposal provides the Convention an opportunity to recognize an obvious economic cost of the educational process, while establishing a basic principle, at half the amount. I would urge your support.

[Proposal No. 70 (page A-45) was defeated.]

#### Financial Aid—Summer School

**D. Alan Williams** (University of Virginia): On behalf of the proponents of Amendment No. 71, I move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to call attention to the fact that Nos. 71 and 72 are two quite separate items and shouldn't be viewed as being the same. For some time this Association has permitted students to receive aid in the summer after their first year. But a great number of us have found that, for many students, one of the most important experiences they can have is an academic experience before they begin extensive participation in the summer, particularly those engaged in contact sports who need the opportunity to encounter academic matters before they encounter athletic matters.

What this amendment proposes is that we extend the same opportunity to the student in the summer before his or her freshman year that we allow the student once actively involved in what is now called the first enrollment. It should be pointed out that the student who avails himself or herself of this opportunity is then an enrolled student and cannot transfer. The student has to be one who is accepted and whose performance is not dependent upon successful completion of the summer school.

I urge your support. I think you will find that this will increase, particularly, the academic survival rate of many of your students.

**Robert F. Steidel Jr.** (University of California, Berkeley): I agree with the last speaker. Every single argument that he put forth is exactly the same as the one I would like to state to you. But I come to the exact opposite conclusion and urge you to oppose this legislation for exactly the same reasons that he urged you to be for it.

The reason is that the word "unconditionally" poisons the entire legislation. Now, I agree with the whole idea of it. We have found very dramatic improvement in those students who attend the summer session before their regular admission date, but we have found that this attendance is so important that we require it as a condition of their admission.

So what happens is, and the reasoning for having a conditional admission is, that if you don't take this summer program you don't get in. Then we turn around and say that you are in a Catch 71 instead of a Catch 72; and the very purpose of having to accommodate this, the NCAA legislation would deny them the whole thing. I urge you to oppose it and vote for No. 72.

**John O. Bolvin** (University of Pittsburgh): Mr. President, I would like to rise in support of my colleague from Virginia and support this legislation. I can stand here and give as many reasons for supporting this as we have students admitted to our institution. Every one of our student-athletes admitted, for some reason or another, could benefit from summer school prior to entering.

Some of the reasons have been given. In our institution our students enter in arts and sciences for liberal studies, they enter into engineering, nursing and other professional schools. Each one has their own reason for being admitted. Of the 100 or so students that we admit each year, we have 100 reasons. Some of the reasons, though, are more important ones. Even for the strong student, for many of these students it is really difficult in this fall term, if they are participating, to have laboratory classes. Even though our scheduling can accommodate a few, it doesn't accommodate all.

We would like to see these students have a chance to have a laboratory at a time that does not conflict with their athletic programs. The first year that the student is there, they have no perception of the expectations of their coaches or the institution. This helps to set it clear. Secondly, it puts the emphasis on the student-athletes, and this one we would have to support 100 percent.

The next reason is that we have students who are weaker; and some of those students need remedial work in a variety of areas, in one area and maybe possibly in two. All of this remediation is necessary. It is the most beneficial time to make the student aware of their instructions and to study.

Our support service people have worked for years at trying to get such legislation as this that is being proposed. I, therefore, ask you to support this legislation.

**Chalmer G. Hixson** (Wayne State University): Mr. President, I am in favor of the student and know the needs of the students that come to our university. I urge you to defeat this legislation. I have three reasons.

First of all, if you were enthusiastic about defeating Nos. 70 and 71 and you consider the financial consequences of this legislation and what the pressures to keep up with the Joneses will place upon you, this is a real financial burden compared to those two pieces of legislation. It should be defeated for that reason.

This legislation would allow those in formal practice sessions to be scheduled the summer before the first enrollment for all first enrollees. I don't think that that is the kind of thing we want. By a quirk in Constitution 3-9, our summer basketball legislation, this would allow you to bring your men's basketball team to campus, give them financial aid and have them all play on the same team in a summer league. I urge

the defeat of this legislation.

[Proposal No. 71 (pages A-45-46) was defeated.]

### **Financial Aid--Summer School**

**Chalmer G. Hixson** (Wayne State University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of No. 72.

[The motion was seconded.]

My colleague who spoke first on No. 71 agrees with me that No. 71 is not the same kind of legislation as No. 72. No. 72 speaks to a very small group of student-athletes that come to our universities and are required to be in programs in order to continue in school as part of the regular program, and they are there with other students.

The other students are allowed financial aid. In fact, they are given financial aid and the student-athlete must turn down that financial aid. Now, to be fair to the student-athlete that is in that program, we need this legislation; and I urge you to pass it.

**Robert F. Steidel Jr.** (University of California, Berkeley): This original legislation, although it has been presented for the Council, was one of the recommended pieces of legislation from the Committee on Academic Eligibility; and it stems from some of our experiences with what is known as the "summer bridge program."

This was a program that was Federally initiated for those students who come in from backgrounds that are not usually recipient to a university education. We found that those who came in the fall of 1978 succeeded to a degree that was unexpected and then in 1980, when we analyzed the year 1978-79, we found that those who had participated in that summer program outperformed their colleagues who had not participated in the program and were regular-admission candidates.

In 1981, we found the same thing; and we found that they not only outperformed the regular-admission people, but that the second year was doing exactly the same thing as the first year was. So we had a program that was succeeding far beyond our expectations, and the only fault that I found in this program is that it was denied to student-athletes.

This legislation corrects that inequity, and I urge you to support this piece of legislation.

**Marion Henry** (Prairie View A&M University): Mr. President, I rise in support of the present piece of legislation for the following reason. We, as athletic representatives, often speak to the point that athletes are students first and athletes second. At our respective institutions, the other entities in the universities, they go out and recruit their students in pharmacy, engineering, liberal arts and the other disciplines with respect to the institution. We, as coaches, are not afforded to do the same thing.

This would afford us an opportunity to actually recruit a student; and, incidentally, the student is an athlete which makes them competitive with all other students at the university. I request your support of this legislation.

[Proposal No. 72 (page A-46) was approved.]

## Financial Aid—Pell Grants

**John R. Davis** (Oregon State University): Mr. President, on behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Amendment No. 73.

[The motion was seconded.]

Because this legislation is tied to Federal legislation, the membership deserves some clarification of the current status of the Pell Grants; and, with the indulgence of the chair, I would like to do that.

Currently, the limitation provided in the constitution for the BEOG, now known as the Pell Grants, is a limitation of tuition, fees, room and board and the miscellaneous expenses allowed under the cost-of-education formula of the U.S. Department of Education.

Therefore, at the present time, a student who qualifies for the full BEOG or Pell Grant of sufficient magnitude can receive the tuition, fees, room and board and the miscellaneous allowance, which in most institutions is defined as course-related books plus \$300 a year because the miscellaneous-expense allowance in the cost-of-education formula is \$400.

The point here is that, even though students may qualify for additional financial aid through BEOG, student-athletes cannot receive any more aid than the NCAA full grant plus the \$300, as I just mentioned. At the time the legislation, Amendment No. 73, was developed, the Department of Education had proposed to increase the miscellaneous expenses allowed in the formula from \$400 up to \$1,100, subject to some institutional discretion.

Recognizing that this amount would more accurately reflect the financial need of many qualified students, the Council felt that the increasing of the miscellaneous-expense allowance from \$400 to \$900, just slightly less than the potential total, would then be most appropriate. This would permit the needy student to receive financial aid in an amount defined by the Department of Education as necessary for the student's education and, at the same time, not allowing for institutional discretion.

Just a comment at this point—that never happened. The Department of Education never did increase the miscellaneous-expense allowance in the cost-of-education formula to \$1,100. It is still \$400 and, with the budget of the Federal government unlikely to increase, that amount is likely to stay at \$400.

At the same time, the Council felt that the miscellaneous allowance should be in addition to books, because that was the basic intent of the miscellaneous-expense allowance.

The second point in Amendment No. 73 is that it, therefore, allows for the provision of full NCAA grant-in-aid, that is, including books plus the miscellaneous-expense allowance.

A third point, since we are advised that divorcing the NCAA limit from Federal regulations might have some merit, the reference to the cost-of-education formula was deleted as shown in Amendment No. 73. Now, that does create a problem for us, though; and that is the reason for the Amendment No. 73-1.

The amendment as it now stands, No. 73, no longer ties the miscellaneous-expense allowance to the cost-of-education formula. In other words, the term "miscellaneous expenses" in the Pell Grant is still open to institutional interpretation almost entirely. This would have the effect of allowing an institution to define miscellaneous expenses as the miscellaneous expenses in the formula, plus clothing allowance, travel allowance, et cetera, up to a value of \$900.

In other words, the language "miscellaneous expenses" in Amendment No. 73 and "miscellaneous expenses" under the cost-of-education formula are two entirely different things. Therefore, even though the amendment to the amendment, No. 73-1, would tie the miscellaneous-expense allowance to the cost-of-education formula, as defined by the Department of Education, and we tie ourselves to Federal regulations, this was deemed to be the lesser of the two evils, the other being the opportunity of institutions to apply discretion in the determination of the award.

So, in summary then, we have two choices in the legislation. With the amendment to the amendment, No. 73-1, the legislation would allow a full NCAA grant-in-aid, including books, plus the miscellaneous allowance as defined by the cost-of-education formula. If the miscellaneous-expense allowance is ever increased by Federal legislation, that would permit an increase in that allowance up to a maximum of \$900.

From a practical viewpoint, since the allowance is currently \$400, the effective change of legislation of No. 73-1 would be an increase in the allowance to qualified students by \$100, since books is not deducted from the miscellaneous-expense allowance. Without Amendment No. 73-1, with adoption of No. 73, a qualified student could receive up to \$900 of miscellaneous expenses as defined partly by the institution, if the institution receives a Pell Grant entitlement in that amount. This would have the effect of making student-athletes more like the students on the campus with a full entitlement, but it could result in differences between institutions and could increase institutional costs by about \$600 a student.

To provide a means, in summary, for dealing more effectively with the financial needs of the very needy student, I recommend adoption of this legislation with the Amendment to Amendment, No. 73-1.

[Proposal No. 73-1 (page A-47) was approved.]

[Proposal No. 73 (pages A-46-47) was approved as amended by Proposal No. 73-1.]

## Financial Aid—Income

**Keith Broman** (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 74.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this legislation is to relieve an inequity that I believe exists. A regular university student at Christmas time can work, a regular student-athlete at Christmas time can work and those amounts are not counted. A student-athlete who excels and who has been selected for an approved all-star event cannot receive pay for that event.



This legislation would allow up to a maximum of \$2,000, not to count against the basic grant. I urge its acceptance.

**Clarence E. Gaines** (Winston-Salem State University): Speaking for the Special Events Committee, we are in opposition to this because some of the smaller schools and some of the larger ones want the basic grants program that is administered by that institution. This \$2,000 would have to be counted as income. I am pretty sure that the youngster is not going to report this back, and it would place the entire basic grants program in jeopardy.

**Stephen Horn** (California State University, Long Beach): Could I ask whether the Council has looked at this from the standpoint of an unusual recruiting inducement that would not be available to most members of the Association?

**President Frank:** The answer is no, the Council has not considered this. Any other questions?

[Proposal No. 74 (pages A-47-48) was defeated.]

#### **Maximum Awards—Division I Women**

**G. Jean Cerra** (University of Missouri, Columbia): On behalf of the Special Committee on Legislative Review and the NCAA Council, I move adoption of No. 75.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Amendment No. 75-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

As you can see from Amendment No. 75-1, that particular move simply takes the golf maximum financial award limit out of the head-count category and into the equivalency category. This particular recommendation came from the Women's Golf Committee because, in essence, they were realizing a reduction of two scholarships off of what they are currently operating under.

In their behalf, I support this particular proposal.

[Proposal No. 75-1 (page A-49) was approved by Division I.]

In regard to Proposal No. 75, let me give you a little background information. The Special Committee on Legislative Review spent considerable time reviewing several combinations of numbers and evaluating the merits and calculations based on head count versus equivalencies. During various times in the past year, the proposed figures were made known publicly through the NCAA News and a variety of professional women's meetings so that feedback could be obtained.

Then the committee further considered and discussed at length all submitted suggestions and implemented several changes in its revised and final recommendation to the Council. The rationale for these figures were based on the size of the prospective student-athlete pool, the inherent risk of injury in the sport, the competitive squad size and/or the particular team scoring method, et cetera.

Groupings of sports and head-count or equivalency categories were based on a variety of reasons, including the need of a sport for team

limit by position or event, the particular popularity of the sport in terms of visibility and the consequences of possible stockpiling.

Serious and careful thought was given to the financial impact of the recommended figures on the member institutions' ability to meet Title IX proportionality requirements. It is for this reason that some of the women's financial aid limits in comparable sports are slightly higher than for men. This was intentional and was designed to give member institutions enough flexibility to compensate for either the 95 or the 75 football scholarships they might be awarding and still be able to arrive at their total women's program quota.

For the most part, the financial aid limits presented here still result in figures lower than those currently familiar to most women under other governing rules, thereby providing member institutions the possible opportunity to realize the cost savings. The committee encourages your support of this proposal.

**President Frank:** I should mention that No. 76 is an amendment to No. 75, but it has been withdrawn.

[Proposal No. 75 (pages A-48-49) was approved by Division I as amended by Proposal No. 75-1.]

[Proposal No. 76 (page A-50) was withdrawn.]

#### **Maximum Awards—Division II Women**

**P. LaVerne Sweat** (Hampton Institute): Mr. President, on behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 77.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment allows financial aid limitations for women's programs in Division II that are based on equivalencies in all sports. At present, the NCAA women's program must utilize financial aid limitations which were designed for men's programs. The purpose of the amendment is to provide financial aid limitations specifically designed for women.

Any differences in number would refer to those sports in the women's programs with greater emphasis than the men's programs or due to balance of financial aid proportionality requirements in Title IX.

[Proposal No. 77 (pages A-50-51) was approved by Division II.]

#### **Financial Aid Limitations**

**Kenneth W. Herrick** (Texas Christian University): Mr. President, I move adoption of Amendment No. 78.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, there are amendments to Amendment No. 78, and I would suggest that the proposer of the amendments to the amendment step up.

**James W. Lessig** (Bowling Green State University): Mr. President, I am a member of the NCAA Ice Hockey Committee. I move the adoption of Amendment No. 78-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 78-1 would change the original legislation to allow, in the sport of



ice hockey in Division I, for those athletes to continue to receive the actual amount of tuition, fees, room and board and books on an equivalency basis. The reason we are requesting this is that approximately 35 to 40 schools play Division I ice hockey and in each of these schools it is a revenue-producing sport. In fact, at some it is the No. 1 revenue sport in terms of dollars generated, making it much like football and basketball for those schools.

Since it is not a sport played by many of the schools in Division I, passage of this amendment will not affect the programs at those institutions. Also, I might further request that, if your school does not sponsor ice hockey and you don't feel comfortable in voting yes on the amendment, then I would request that you might abstain and let those schools who sponsor the sport vote on the issue, since passage will only affect those schools sponsoring the sport in Division I. Others will not be affected.

I would also like to ask a clarification from the chair as to whether on this amendment, may only those schools who play Division I ice hockey vote on the amendment?

**President Frank:** No. As was stated in the program, Divisions I and II schools are qualified to vote on this one.

**Mr. Lessig:** I urge your adoption of No. 78-1.

**President Frank:** Was your question on No. 78-1?

**Mr. Lessig:** The amendment, yes.

**President Frank:** Only Division I.

**Mr. Lessig:** Divisions II and III schools playing Division I ice hockey cannot vote?

**President Frank:** They will not vote on No. 78-1.

**Mr. Lessig:** I again urge those schools who do not play to consider abstaining, while only the schools in Division I who play ice hockey in Division I vote.

**Andrew T. Mooradian** (University of New Hampshire): I rise in support of the past speaker and hope the vote will only be taken by schools in Division I hockey.

[Proposal No. 78-1 (pages A-51-52) was approved by Division I.]  
**George W. Schubert** (University of North Dakota): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 78-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of the amendment is to place Division I and Division II football and basketball in similar circumstances for athletically related financial aid awards. Therefore, if you read the intent statement on page 45 of the Convention Program, it should read on line 3 "Division I and Division II" member institutions.

**Asa N. Green** (Livingston University): Mr. President, I would hope that the Division II members will vote against this amendment, simply because it seemed very difficult to me in giving aid to athletes—and I understand the substance and the question involved—but philosophically I have problems with an approach that makes a distinction between those athletes that play football and those athletes that play

baseball, swim or play tennis.

[Proposal No. 78-2 (page A-52) was defeated by Division II, 59-67.]  
**President Frank:** We will now go back to the original motion, as amended by No. 78-1.

**Mr. Herrick:** I would like to speak to this amendment before the vote is taken. The most popular college sports by far in Division II are football and basketball. Their popularity enables our colleges to bring in substantial revenues from these particular sports. It seems only logical to me to recognize this fact of life in the dollar amount that we award the students that participate in these sports.

It is not feasible for a school to act alone in this matter on the nonrevenue sports and still compete in those nonrevenue sports any more than a school by itself can limit its grants in football to 15 and compete with other schools that give up to 30 grants in football. Either we all do this or none of us do it.

Now, I would suggest to you that the philosophical argument raised a little earlier is facetious. We do this in our academic programs all the time. If we have a chemistry department that brings in a lot of private grants and government grants, the people in those departments are highly rewarded and there are more scholarships in those departments. And the academic scholarships generally are worth considerably more money. If the physics department in that school is doing very little in the way of bringing in revenue, then I would suggest to you that, in most schools, that department is rewarded accordingly.

In these times of very limited funds for athletics, I believe it behooves us to spend wisely and to reduce the money we spend on the sports that do not produce the major revenues.

**Dean Hayes** (Middle Tennessee State University): I am president of the Division I NCAA Track Coaches Association. I would like to speak against this proposal, not only for the idea of track and field but, hopefully, for all the other sports involved. As an example, in a newspaper article which came out in our newspaper in December, Senator Sasser, who is a member of the Senate Budget Committee, talked about proposals by the Office of Management and Budget for the fiscal year 1983, in which he indicated cuts that were going to be made. Now, this pertains to the Pell Grants or BEOG. The cuts are going too far. Cuts of this magnitude will probably inflict serious hardships on every family in the nation.

Sasser further reports that the Office of Management and Budget is proposing a budget that includes a 57 percent cut in Basic Education Opportunity Grants for college students, or Pell Grants. He indicated in the state of Tennessee more than 34,000 students are going to be affected by this.

If this is the case—and also we find that, especially during this past summer, we had a hard time receiving information as to what would be done with the Pell or BEOG grants and we couldn't get the information until late—you can't get your student-athletes set up in terms of this financial aid, et cetera, so therefore, it becomes very difficult to set these up early enough.

If they lose their grants or have trouble with it in any way, then the student has nothing to fall back on if we don't have the "full scholarships" that we have presently. Leaving us with the full scholarships the way they are gives us flexibility; and, where there is a problem, we can try to cover the student under any situation.

I will give an example, and this is a personal one. We had a student several weeks ago who was validated by BEOG, and this happens occasionally, and in this case they wanted information on two different occasions covering different years. The process took about six months in order to get it covered. At the end of that process, they said they would give the grant and at that time you could only get four years of BEOG, so they would grant him an extra year but would not give him that present year's BEOG. Now, when this case has been brought up in other circumstances, I am at a school which has full grants until this year in track, tennis, golf and baseball. They have been taken away now. We will not have meals starting with next year.

In this case, what do you do? Do you tell the student it is too bad and send them home? That is what I was told.

The idea is that we are trying to protect our student-athletes. We have heard about the protection of the student-athlete, and so on; and I feel we need to go ahead and cover the student-athlete, give the coaches flexibility or the schools the flexibility to be able to cover these programs and these students so that they don't have problems like this.

Sending a junior home, which is what this particular student-athlete was, telling him as a junior, too bad, send them home, does not do the job. In this case, it cuts down on the integrity of your schools, your program and everything that goes with it.

I have a very young team, so I will use myself as a personal example. Sixty percent are freshmen--well, this year it will be 60 percent sophomores on my team. At the end of this year, under the present guidelines that were used this past year, I am probably going to have to inform six sophomores that I will not have scholarship help to have to them next year because of this type of situation. I noticed in your proposal it says that that doesn't take effect until another year, and you may go back and cover the athletes that are already in school.

Now, in a problem such as mine, I will be forced currently to tell six of them I will not have a scholarship for them. At this point, I do not intend to recruit any freshmen; and I still have that problem.

**Richard H. Perry** (University of Southern California): I would speak strongly in opposition to the adoption of Amendment No. 78. I think those institutions that believe in broadly based programs use the term "student-athletes." I have yet to hear anybody refer on their campuses to highly valued student-athletes and lesser-valued student-athletes. It seems to me this proposal immediately creates that categorization of student-athletes on our campuses.

As a representative of a private university with a high tuition factor, we feel equivalencies, as we have stated from the floor on many occasions, already place our sports other than football and basketball at great disadvantage because of the tremendous differential in tuition factors. Passage of this legislation would further impact institutions

with high tuition factors, particularly in those sports such as swimming, tennis or golf, where our student-athletes tend to come from more affluent families and would not qualify for additional financial aid under the existence of this particular program.

To me it represents a continuing movement towards the discrimination of a certain segment of our student-athletes and a further discrimination against the private sector within this organization.

**Stephen Horn** (California State University, Long Beach): Mr. President, in the previous Conventions we have considered comparable proposals; and we have defeated them. I think we have defeated them primarily on the ground that most of us did not want to see a first and second class among varsity student-athletes.

I would add in addition, based on some of the previous comments this morning, that if we are only going to limit grants to those programs that presumably produce revenue, there are obvious implications in the long run for members of this Association as to what student-athletes would have a right to expect from a university when programs do indeed provide revenue.

Further and lastly, I would argue that we in universities, in other programs besides athletics, do not use the money generated for those programs solely in those, such as chemistry or whatnot. We have often used indirect costs to fund research opportunities in the parts of the university that have less opportunity for outside funding or major substantial external support.

So on those reasons as to how we conduct ourselves in the rest of the university, the long-run implications of providing stipends, if you will, for those that generate revenue, and the basic reason of not having two classes of student-athletes, I hope we will again vote this down.

**John E. Nowak** (University of Illinois, Champaign): Mr. President, I ask the delegates to oppose the motion for two reasons. First, the reasons stated already by other speakers, especially Dick Perry from Southern California, that we need to treat all our athletes equally; secondly, and more importantly, because if this motion passes it will make it very difficult, if not impossible, to bring our women's programs up to a level with our men's programs at our campuses.

Realistically, it would only be full scholarships in women's basketball. If we are going to bring women's sports to a position of real importance, an equivalent position with the men's sports, we should defeat this kind of motion so we can have full tuition and full scholarships for the women in room and board expenses and not just limited scholarships for women only and full scholarships for the men football players.

**Bradford W. Hovious** (Delta State University): I urge defeat of this at the Division II level for three reasons. One, in our particular area, we would have competition from NAIA schools, Division I schools in our state and also the many junior colleges in our state that would put us at a disadvantage in recruiting against those people.

It would also cut the total dollars available to our football program by approximately 50 percent. In the past four years, we have had our

football aid reduced by 25 percent. This proposal would be another severe blow to our football program; and, at this particular time, we can't stand that.

**Gwendolyn Norrell** (Michigan State University): I did not know that my colleague from the University of Illinois was going to give my speech; but I do believe that all athletes, women and men, should be treated equally, and I urge you to defeat this amendment.

**Corey Van Fleet** (Oakland University): The college swimming coaches urge your defeat of this proposal due to the fact that our Olympic athletes in swimming, which is a highly visible sport in this country, are predominantly NCAA athletes; and they point to the fact that NCAA swimming championships have been a highly marketable product for our television package. We think those athletes deserve the same courtesies as do all other athletes at the university.

**Chalmer G. Hixson** (Wayne State University): I urge the defeat of this by Division II. Our colleagues in Division I have been talking about two classes of athletes if you pass this. If you pass this for Division II, we will have not two classes but we will have one class—Class 2. It is just not right to all those students.

[Proposal No. 78 (page A-51) was defeated by Divisions I and II as amended by Proposal No. 78-1.]

[The Convention recessed at 12 noon.]

## BUSINESS SESSION

**Tuesday Afternoon, January 12, 1982**

The session convened at 2 p.m., with President James Frank presiding.

### 7. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

#### Maximum Awards—Division I-A Football

**Rev. Edmund P. Joyce** (University of Notre Dame): Mr. President, I wish to move the adoption of Proposal No. 79.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would also like to ask your indulgence while I spend a few minutes explaining the rationale behind this particular proposal. The passing of No. 79 would help to remove what to my mind is an inequity in the current system of allowable grants-in-aid in football. The request for this remedial legislation comes, interestingly enough, from many head football coaches; and it is on their behalf that I introduce the proposal.

While I have this opportunity, I would like to preface my arguments for this particular piece of legislation by saying something about football coaches. These men are practitioners of a difficult profession. Winning is a legitimate objective for all sport teams; but the stakes are so high in football that the pressures for a coach to win, whether internally or externally generated, are obviously quite intense.

On the whole, football coaches are honorable men, interested in the welfare and the education of the athletes under their charge, trying to operate honest, above-board programs as long as there are reasonable rules that place them in an equally competitive situation with each other. It is incumbent, I think, upon us who pass legislation at these annual Conventions to be sensitive to the impact of such legislation on the people who have to live with the rules day in and day out. In other words, the football coaches themselves.

For the 30 years that I have been attending NCAA Conventions, I have frequently felt that we have not given sufficient thought to the unreasonable burden certain ill-considered or hasty legislation places on the coaches. In brief, we have not afforded those who must live with the legislation such input into the debates that accompany the legislation.

I want to make one point clear. I am not suggesting that we should turn the legislation over to the coaches, but I do think we ought to devise better means of getting their professional input in these discussions. If we are ever to eliminate the cancerous abuses that from time to time bring disrespect to the sport of intercollegiate football, we simply must bring the coaches into a partnership with us in the formulation of reasonable, competitive rules.

If we achieve this, I believe they will accept even more readily the

responsibility of policing themselves and their peers. One thing the College Football Association has attempted to do at its annual convention is to involve the head football coaches in all of the discussions. We have found coaches to be eminently reasonable in their proposals for improvement; and much of the constructive legislation sponsored by CFA, including such things as stricter academic standards, more restrictive recruiting periods and so forth, have come from these men.

One proposal that has been made by our coaches is the one that I have agreed to introduce today on their behalf. As far as I am concerned, it, too, is eminently reasonable. What it does is to help insure the graduation of a young athlete who, through no fault of his own, is not involved in the football program during his senior year in school.

There is something mathematically out of kilter with the permissible number of grants-in-aid we have legislated for Division I. I will explain. A coach is allowed to bring in 30 recruits each year but may have only a total of 95 men on the football squad. Assuming the recruitment of good students and no academic mortality among them, a coach who brought in 30 athletes for each of the first three years could recruit only five athletes in the fourth year.

True, he could bring in 24 athletes each of the first three years and 23 in the fourth year. In either case, however, he would be placed at a serious competitive disadvantage with those schools who are willing to bring in 30 recruits each year and then use a run-off system to get rid of the weaker players, thereby maintaining the overall squad at 95. I hope that my conferees in this room will concede that any regulation that encourages a run-off system is reprehensible. It will confirm the suspicion of those critics who feel that our institutions of higher learning are willing to exploit student-athletes for the sake of a winning program.

Now, we also know that some normal attrition is to be expected in a football squad; but it is unlikely, and in this case unpredictable, that 25 of the 120 recruited over a four-year period would fall by the wayside. The attrition particularly would not be so high at those schools that conscientiously recruit able students.

What our coaches are telling us in advancing Proposal No. 79 is that they are perfectly willing to live with the 30-95 limitation if they had somewhat more flexibility in caring for those students who, through lack of higher or unpredictable attrition rates, would have to be removed from their grants-in-aid in order to keep the total squad size to 95.

The coaches feel that if they had five slots for the fourth-year student-athlete, it would no longer be part of the football program, and this would enable five young men in need of financial assistance to graduate with their class.

I cannot imagine a more reasonable request; and there is no question, please note, of a competitive advantage in the football program of a school with lesser attrition vis-a-vis one with a higher. In each instance, the total football squad will remain at 95. What are the arguments

against Proposal No. 79? I would be interested in hearing them, if there are any.

The single argument that occurs to me is the expense involved in the five additional grants-in-aid, or a five percent increase in the total cost for this line item. This seems to me to be a small price indeed to discourage an unfair run-off system, a price also that most schools could legitimately justify being charged against the football program.

For these reasons, in conclusion, I strongly urge your support for Proposal No. 79.

**Wayne Duke** (Big Ten Conference): Mr. President, my name is Wayne Duke, Big Ten Conference. My name is not to be confused with another gentleman who transposed his name, although we are both made of violence. Father Joyce indicated he would like to know of the arguments against this particular proposal. I would like to present some.

Father Joyce, you and I had the pleasure of being together the last couple of evenings; and I respect your eloquence. I am not as eloquent as you. However, I have attended more NCAA Conventions than you, by two or three. In my opinion, the limitations on national athletic grants is singularly the most important piece of legislation that I have observed in more than 30 years of college athletic administration.

I think that college football interest equity has been the greatest I have ever observed. We, in college football, should be very proud of that which has transpired. I think one of the biggest problems we have in college football is domination by a select few of the polls, bowls and television. I think it has been so great that for a period of time during the course of the national football scene we have different teams ranked No. 1, more competitive in quality.

Young men go out on the field and say, "I have a chance to beat you." The fans do, too; and, as a result, our college football attendance has been up and our television ratings have been up.

In my opinion, as I suggested before, the national limitation on athletic grants of the 30-95 rule is singularly the most important piece of legislation that I have seen in more than 30 years of college athletic administration. Let's sort it out. By adopting this legislation, you are going to increase the grants from 95 to 100 and you are going to legitimize run-off. Speaking not from notes but from the heart, I urgently suggest you reject this proposal.

**President Frank:** Are there any further comments?

**Father Joyce** (University of Notre Dame): Mr. Chairman.

**President Frank:** Father Joyce can speak again.

**Father Joyce:** I am sure Wayne and I will not get involved in a prolonged debate, but I would like to add one other comment. I find myself, of course, agreeing with much of what he said, but it was just the conclusion when he indicated that he thought adding these five grants to nonparticipants in the football program will actually engender a run-off system.

My whole argument was that it does the opposite and prevents it from happening, because 30 times four is 120; and you have got to get



rid, somehow or other, of the 25 to bring in the 30. None of our coaches want to do that. The argument is that there is normal attrition; but in many instances the normal attrition is not 25, it may be 20. Simply to be able to provide financial help for five men who are not part of the football program will have nothing to do, in my mind, with any kind of run-off system nor will it affect the 30-95 overall limitation on squads in the quality that has been engendered by this.

Except for your conclusion, Wayne, I agree with the other things that you have said about having restrictions on numbers.

[Proposal No. 79 (page A-53) was defeated by Division I-A Football.]

#### **Maximum Awards—Division I-AA Football**

**Arliss L. Roaden** (Tennessee Technological University): I am currently president of the Ohio Valley Conference. For reasons which I should like to state, the Ohio Valley Conference is moving to withdraw this amendment this afternoon.

We continue to believe in the substance of the amendment, that is, that 65 scholarships in I-AA Football provides for high-quality competition. However, we are mindful that a significant number of institutions and conferences will likely be joining us in I-AA; and so that they will have a chance to vote on this amendment next year we are withdrawing it at this time, with the full intention of reintroducing it next year.

[Proposal No. 80 (page A-53) was withdrawn.]

#### **Exempted Players—Division II**

**Ade L. Sponberg** (North Dakota State University): Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of Amendment No. 81.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is merely to allow need-base recruited athletes in football and basketball to participate as well. It is currently in effect in our sports other than football and basketball in Division II, and this is indicative to us that it is administratively feasible. It is cost-effective and it would allow for the equal-protection problem.

It is very difficult to refuse a need-base student the opportunity to participate. It would foster far greater participation. It represents an incentive to the coach in a limited grant-in-aid program to explore all sources of funding for their athletes. I urge its adoption.

[Proposal No. 81 (pages A-53-54) was approved by Division II.]

#### **Sports Sponsorship**

**Judith R. Holland** (University of California, Los Angeles): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 82.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think the intent is quite clear on this, and I am not going to read what is in the book for you. I do want to call your attention to the fact there are exceptions granted for institutions that offer programs only

for one sex or that do not decide to affiliate their women's programs with the NCAA.

I would also like to call your attention to the fact this is not effective until 1985, which gives member institutions plenty of time to be able to meet this requirement.

[Proposal No. 82 (pages A-54-55) was approved.]

#### **Membership Dues**

**Charley Scott** (University of Alabama): For the NCAA Council and representing the Executive Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 83.

[The motion was seconded.]

I now move adoption of the amendment, No. 83-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The amendment is to delete Section (2) under (a) and to incorporate paragraph (1) back into the paragraphs with the (a). You will have to bear with me because the communication seems to have dropped here. My understanding is that the Council concluded that it should not fix dues in the future without your having the opportunity to vote on it. If that is incorrect from the standpoint of the Council, maybe someone else can speak to it.

**President Frank:** You are correct, Charley. What you have said was correct, and that is why the Council has sponsored the amendment to the amendment.

[Proposal No. 83-1 (page A-56) was approved by all divisions.]

**Mr. Scott:** Mr. Chairman, last year I pointed out to the Convention that the Executive Committee planned a study of the dues structure with the possibility of a proposal for an increase this year or at some time. I will call to your attention that the previous increase in dues took place in 1975, seven years ago, and before that in 1951, which was 24 years prior to that change in 1975. I doubt that you are purchasing anything today with the rates that go back that far.

In the past, the dues have been set arbitrarily; and I say it in the sense that they were not related to anything in particular, as far as I have ascertained. Some of us, in considering the dues structure, had the thought that relating the dues to specific services might have some merit. This proposal does that, and it is intended to be a model for the future.

Not all of the services provided to the membership by the Association are included in this model, but those that are included are enjoyed by all of us. The operation of this Convention, for example, will cost the Association in excess of \$130 per member. You paid \$25, if you paid the same as I did. The publications that are sent to the membership will cost in excess of \$390 each year.

The work of the sports rules committees will cost in excess of \$118 per member. The compilation of the statistics will cost in excess of \$125 per institution. Those costs for those services that are received by all of us come to approximately \$920 per member institution.

Further looking at these particular services and their costs suggested that we might continue the consideration of a 2-1-1 ratio for Divisions I, II and III, in that order. If we do that calculation, we come to the proposed schedule of dues in the latter part of this proposal. Some members believe the increase is warranted and want to provide their fair share, but they thought that the increase to get into this model should be phased.

Accordingly, a two-step proposal is presented in this proposal. I recommend your approval.

[Proposal No. 83 (pages A-55-56) was approved by all divisions as amended by Proposal No. 83-1.]

#### **Membership Classification—Division IV**

**Henry T. Lowe** (University of Missouri, Columbia): Mr. President, in behalf of the sponsors of Item No. 84, we are asking to withdraw Nos. 84, 88, 89, 120, 121 and 122. Mr. Chairman, I would beg your indulgence for just a few comments about this withdrawal.

Collectively, these items relate to the Division IV concept. They were submitted for the agenda at the special Convention and at the same time, or shortly thereafter, for the agenda of this Convention. The sponsors retain their belief in the Division IV concept. This concept puts all the sports programs of the qualifying members under one set of bylaws. The Division IV concept points in a direction, we believe, this Association will take in the future.

For lack of a better term, we call it a part of the federation principle where divisions of this Association will have more autonomy and member schools a greater voice in the affairs of a particular division. In view of the actions that were taken at the special Convention and at this Convention, the sponsors of these items want to evaluate and refine the proposals for resubmission at a later date.

[Proposal No. 84 (page A-56) was withdrawn.]

[Proposal No. 85 (pages A-56-57) was withdrawn.]

#### **Resolution: Multidivision Classification**

**S. Dean Ehlers** (James Madison University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 86.

[The motion was seconded.]

We believe in a comprehensive athletic program and we certainly are committed to a full classification minimum of sports programs, but we are also concerned about inflation. We are very concerned about the number of sports that are being dropped by member institutions. We feel that this may be a means of saving sports participation opportunities for various members of our student bodies, and we urge your consideration of this proposal.

[Resolution No. 86 (page A-57) was defeated.]

#### **Change of Division Membership**

**Richard H. Perry** (University of Southern California): In behalf of

the Special Committee on NCAA Governance, Organization and Services, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 87.

[The motion was seconded.]

This particular proposal is from the governance committee as a result of recent instances in which an institution moved its membership from Division III to Division I, apparently on an almost overnight basis. Philosophically, it is difficult for us to imagine how an institution could subscribe to the Division III philosophy one year and be committed to a legitimate athletic program the next.

This is another of the several problems cited in the St. Louis Convention last month in regard to the almost uncontrolled growth in Division I as a result of the lure of men's basketball championships. All this says is that you can change your membership division under the usual procedures, but you can move only one division, from III to II, or I to II, or II to I. You cannot move from III to I or from I to III.

It is important to understand this treats only the matter of moving the institution's membership classification. It does not deal in any way with placing a single sport in a different division. This is still covered under a different bylaw section, and it is not being proposed at this time. I urge the adoption of Proposal No. 87.

[Proposal No. 87 (page A-57) was approved by all divisions.]

[Proposal No. 88 (pages A-58-59) was withdrawn.]

[Proposal No. 89 (pages A-59-60) was withdrawn.]

#### **Sports Sponsorship Criteria**

**Gene E. Hooks** (Wake Forest University): On behalf of the Classification Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 90.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to permit a Division I member to count indoor or outdoor track, but not both, in meeting the minimum sports sponsorship criteria for Division I membership and for membership in Division I-A or I-AA Football.

By way of comment, the thinking of the Classification Committee in proposing this amendment was that the athletes and coaches of the two track programs and cross country are the same at most institutions. The greatest degree of difference lies between track and cross country. The committee believed that an institution received too much credit toward satisfaction of the sports sponsorship requirements if it could gain a count of three sports from essentially the same group and the same activity.

Because there is somewhat less carry-over to the cross country and because differences in weather often dictate emphasis upon either indoor or outdoor track, it was felt that the more favorable proposal was to ask the institution to choose between the two tracks in counting sponsorship. The Classification Committee considers the sponsorship an important criterion and urges the membership to adopt this proposal, which would prevent any shortcuts in meeting it.

**Evan Denney** (University of Montana): Mr. Chairman and members of this Convention, I speak in opposition to this proposed

amendment to the bylaws. This amendment, which would allow Division I institutions to utilize indoor or outdoor track but not both to meet the sports sponsorship criteria, has some implications I find impossible to support.

These implications include a significantly adverse impact on indoor and outdoor track and some institutions, which will choose to sponsor only indoor track, and others only outdoor track. As a result, this nation's efforts to remain competitive in the Olympic Games most assuredly will be diminished. Such an amendment will also create an adverse financial impact on many institutions just when we are being told by our presidents to hold down costs.

A combination of both indoor and outdoor track does allow economies to accrue which would not accrue through the adding of a new sport to meet the sports sponsorship criteria. As such, I urge the membership to reject this proposal.

**Cecil N. Coleman** (Midwestern City Conference): Mr. President, when we arrived at this Convention a couple of days ago, a number of us were surprised to find on the eight-sport requirement that the compliance period of September 1, 1983, was interpreted to mean that, in order to comply with it, you had to put in the additional two sports during the 1982-83 academic year.

In effect, if No. 90 is passed, what this legislatively does is require three additional sports to be put in for those that have to add the two. I think some of the arguments that have come up about utilizing the same coaches and the same athletes basically is true. However, from a budgetary point in the commitment to the programs, you have three separate budgets that are running each of these respective programs, and I would urge this Convention to vote this measure down.

**Dean Hayes** (NCAA Division I Track Coaches Association): The only other thing I would like to add is that I agree with the cost factors, et cetera, which does make it more economical when you need eight sports, but also the idea that the NCAA does have a championship both indoors and out. Therefore, if you have an actual championship in each sport, if we pass this resolution, then it means one sport in the NCAA would not be countable towards our eight numbers. Therefore, I would prefer to keep both of them in there.

**Marion Henry** (Prairie View A&M University): Mr. President, I concur with the previous speakers; and I rise to request that you vote not to require these sports to be deleted from their present posture, for the following reasons. I recognize that many institutions have individual coaches, but many institutions also have a carry-over where a football coach oftentimes ends up coaching in another sport.

This is also true with some athletes. There are athletes that you may think are the same athletes; but in many of our own programs, if you look at some of your track personnel they, too, may have participated in some other sport. It just so happened that track happened to have more of our athletes than indoor, outdoor or cross country. I encourage you to support my efforts in not deleting this particular proposal.

**Francis X. Rienzo** (Georgetown University): Although I support

the goals and aims of the NCAA Council and the Classification Committee in its attempt to tighten the criteria for conferences with automatic qualification, I suggest that this Proposal No. 90 will have a substantial detrimental effect on track and field in relegating it to a second-class status.

This is discriminatory and debilitating to a sport that has been an integral part of intercollegiate athletics for over 100 years and has been the keystone of the United States' participation in the Olympic Games. I suggest that this is not only discriminatory but negative legislation, that it hurts track and field unjustly and singles out only one sport of the broad spectrum of NCAA sports for not counting as being part of the criteria.

Therefore, I recommend that you defeat this legislation, indicating to the Classification Committee that, although we support their attempts to tighten criteria, they should find another solution.

**Edwin B. Crowder** (University of Colorado): I would point out that each of these three sports has a national championship and we would, in fact, be combining two sports which are identified as separate (because they do have a national championship) if we vote for this amendment. I suggest you vote against it.

[Proposal No. 90 (page A-60) was defeated by Division I.]

[Proposal No. 91 (pages A-60-61) was withdrawn.]

### Division II Criteria

**Aldo A. Sebben** (Southwest Missouri State University): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 92.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to reduce from six to four the sports sponsorship criterion for membership in Division II and to specify that at least two sports must be team sports according to the NCAA definition. This proposal is the direct result of a survey of the Division II membership conducted last summer.

Just a few years ago the vast majority of the Division II members said in a similar survey that they wanted a sports sponsorship requirement of six sports or more. Now, financial demands have created a direct reversal of that desire. Nearly three-fourths, or 74 percent, of the membership of Division II responded in the survey. Of those, more than two-thirds, 67.6 percent, said to reduce the six-sport requirement to either five or four.

Therefore, the Division II Steering Committee asked the Council to sponsor this proposal. We inserted the requirement of two team sports because we did not want an institution to be able to meet the requirement with cross country, indoor track, outdoor track and one other sport.

Team sports generally require a greater program commitment and involve greater participation. So two of the minimum four men's sports would have to be team sports, baseball, basketball, football, soccer, volleyball, water polo, lacrosse or ice hockey.

For those who believe Division II is abandoning its commitment to



offering as much participation as possible for its student-athletes, it should be pointed out that Division III never has had a requirement of more than four sports and that division sponsorship average has remained relatively constant at about 10 sports per institution.

We feel that the Division II average will remain at around eight, as it is now. Many institutions, especially in the South, are struggling to maintain this six-sports program and would rather devote their strained resources to a program they can afford to sustain at a bona fide Division II level.

**Lonnie J. Davis** (Northern Kentucky University): Because of the aforementioned items, in addition we must remember that cutting the six back to four does not mean that each Division II institution has to cut the number of sports. I would urge the Division II membership to support this item.

**John A. Hogan** (Colorado School of Mines): I would like to refer the membership to the constitution, Article 2, which reads, "Purposes and Fundamental Policy, Section 1. Purposes. The purposes of this Association are: (a) To initiate, stimulate and improve intercollegiate athletic programs for student-athletes and to promote and develop educational leadership, physical fitness, sports participation . . ." et cetera.

So it says in Article 2 that the purpose is to encourage sports participation. As a member of Division II, we have been proud that Division II has placed an emphasis on participation. At our university, we have at least three sports that require less than \$2,000 to run; and I would say this, that the presidents perhaps need to encourage their athletic directors to use more ingenuity, more imagination, to find ways of encouraging broader-based sports participation. For me, to call an intercollegiate athletic program a program, in which you have but four sports, I believe is patently absurd.

Pursue this. Next year it will be three sports, then two, then one; and then someone is going to talk about their athletics and call it an athletic program with one sport.

**Edward S. Steitz** (Springfield College): Just a point of information. I know my good friend Aldo purposely did not mean to omit indicating to you that that questionnaire was filled out by the CEOs and was never filled out by the faculty representatives or the directors of athletics. I just wanted this group to know that. There is a significant difference as to who fills in a questionnaire and sends it in to the NCAA offices.

I am going to read what I have written, and I didn't know John was going to the mike to use some of the clout that I thought I would try to present.

The NCAA constitution, in Article 2, Section 1-(a), under the heading "Purposes and Fundamental Policy," states: "To initiate, stimulate, and improve intercollegiate athletic programs for student-athletes and to promote and develop educational leadership, physical fitness, sports participation as a recreational pursuit and athletic excellence."

It is incongruous to speak in terms of stimulate, improve, promote

and the pursuit of excellence and, in the same breath, lower our standards and stray from the philosophy of broad-based programs. In 1978, Division II adopted the philosophy of broad-based programs and set six as the minimum number. Even though many of us felt that eight should be the minimum, there was a compromise as to how low we should go.

The question has been raised as to whether we don't have some smoke screens in this legislation. The first is that institutions might be overly interested in promoting one or two sports over others, in order to be selected for postseason football or basketball championships and thereby gain an advantage over those institutions that believe in our philosophy of broad-based programs.

The second concerns NCAA championships for women. My institution is proud of the fact that we have been pioneers in the women's championship movement. By lowering our standards, are we not saying to our women's programs, we have a four-sport program requirement for men, and at the most, ladies, it will be no more than four sports for women regardless of the need for these programs and the fantastic growth qualitatively and quantitatively of women's athletics?

The question must be asked as to whether or not we would be playing right into the hands of those on our campuses who would welcome an opportunity to cut into collegiate athletic budgets by going from six to four. In light of the fact that this proposition is in conflict with Division II's philosophy and, indeed, our very own NCAA constitution, I urge, Mr. President, defeat of this proposition.

**Thomas J. Niland Jr.** (Le Moyne College): Mr. President, I would urge the defeat of this resolution; and I would like to just inform the people here that the poor is no longer the South but up to the Northeast. Our tax base is dwindling; our factories are moving to the South. Our heating bills are rising; and we are having probably as many, if not more, problems than you are in supporting our programs.

But six is not an unreasonable number of programs to support. I would like to echo the sentiments that we should try to defeat this proposal and keep our programs alive.

**Norman D. Kay** (St. Leo College): I think this august body should use its talents to promote intercollegiate athletics at all levels. In some cases it might be expedient, politically, to move to four; but I think that this body has a moral responsibility to promote athletics and find other means to cut costs.

**Billy D. McGee** (Columbus College): Before I make my statement, I would like to say our president permitted the athletic director and the faculty rep to have some input in this survey that the NCAA sent out. In fact, we told him how to vote. Title IX requirements, the double-digit inflation and the drastically declining enrollment have had a most devastating effect on Division II schools in Georgia. The South Atlantic Conference, with which we were affiliated, was dissolved; and one member institution simply could not, in view of the constraints I have just mentioned, maintain a viable, realistic six-sport program. Subsequently, that school withdrew from the NCAA.

We, at Columbus College, want to remain a part of the NCAA. We



want to remain a part of Division II, but we need the relief that is afforded by Proposal 92. Please vote for us and give us that relief.

**Asa N. Green** (Livingston University): First of all, as president, I would like to express my hope that if somebody came and wanted to know where Livingston stood on an issue that it would at least begin in my office. I think that is generally accepted practice, and I think most of us do as another institution just commented. If that relates to athletics, I normally talk to the athletic director; and if it relates to academics, I talk to the academic vice-president.

I am also concerned and would rebut one point which has been made, and that is this would open the way for institutions to concentrate their resources in one or two sports and thus gain an advantage in postseason competition. I would point out that we have scholarship limits and other restrictions upon our competition and eligibility, which I think would restrain that; and I really don't think many institutions would do that.

Your outlook at this, I suppose, depends on where you start from. It is true, for example, that institutions in the South have somewhat a unique problem at the moment because the institutions in the South, particularly the smaller ones, historically have not had many women's athletics.

We are confronted by the need now to implement programs in women's athletics. I think most of us are doing or trying to do what we are trying to do at Livingston, which is to build a level of support for our women's programs that will be equal to the support of the men's programs. If cuts were made, I would almost be certain they would be made in men's sports, to the extent that we are cutting men's sports to benefit women's sports.

We are doing this at a time when we do have rapid inflation, particularly in the cost of travel, which has increased enormously over the last two years. We are doing it at a time when we are confronted by declining revenues. I think revenues at the public institutions, certainly in every state, have been adversely affected by the current recession.

We have also the prospect of the declining enrollment, and let me point out that reference was made earlier in regard to another proposal to the possibility of massive reductions in Federal financial aid programs. If that comes about, I think that we will indeed have a much greater reduction in enrollment.

For those of us who finance our athletic programs out of student fees, we will have a further reduction in revenues available for athletics. The legislation is permissive, and I think the experience of Division III is very much to the point. Division III institutions have a high level of sports sponsorship, yet they have no requirement.

What we are trying to do is to give institutions as much flexibility as possible to cope with a very, very difficult period. I would hope that the delegates in Division II would support this proposal.

**Robert M. Birrenkott** (University of Tampa): If this proposal passes, it would be possible for a Division II institution to meet all the criteria for Division II by sponsoring four sports of tennis, which

requires five, as minimum participants; fencing, five; rifle, four; and golf, five, and would be a legitimate Division II contender involving less than 20 people in their student body.

**President Frank:** It is pointed out that the statement is incorrect. There have to be two team sports. None of the ones you have mentioned are team sports.

[Proposal No. 92 (page A-61) was defeated by Division II, 64-71. A subsequent motion to reconsider was defeated (see page 145).]

### Division II Criteria

**Chalmer G. Hixson** (Wayne State University): On behalf of the Council and the Division II Steering Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 93.

[The motion was seconded.]

The passage of this legislation will make us the same as Divisions I and III in this regard, that the championship rules will be used for season play. You must understand that only those provisions of the championship rules which normally apply to Division II will be required. So this does not bring the 2,000 rule in by the back door of someone. The purpose of this is to prevent those difficult decisions in selecting teams for the play-offs.

It will also prevent the unhappy experience of having student-athletes ineligible for championships defeating your teams and keeping your teams out of the championships. I suggest that you pass this.

**Thomas J. Niland Jr.** (Le Moyne College): I was instrumental, in previous years, in trying to draw up some of this legislation; and Division II has kind of remained free of getting its season legislation, hence the rule on in-season competition. A lot of it was because of our dual membership. The teams that were members of both the NAIA and the NCAA have had a choice to conduct their in-season play and then participate as long as they were at the end of the season for the championship play.

Now, this would eliminate that choice, I believe; and they would no longer have the choice of playing in one or the other.

[Proposal No. 93 (pages A-61-62) was approved by Division II.]

[Proposal No. 94 (page A-62) was withdrawn.]

### Division III Criteria

**Jerry Thompson** (Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 95.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this is to limit the undergraduate enrollment in Division III institutions to 3,500 students. As a result of an NCAA survey on October 26, 1977, the NCAA asked the membership, should an undergraduate male enrollment be a Division III criteria? The results of that particular question were that 73 said yes, 58 said no.

The next question was if there were, what would be the maximum limitation your institution would favor? Enrollment of 750, six voted

for that; 1,000, 23 voted for that; 2,500, 41 voted for that; 5,000, only eight voted for that; 10 voted for "others."

We think that size has something to do with competition. Now Division I-A and I-AA and Division II all have size limitations as far as scholarship programs are concerned, so there must be something to do with the size in those areas.

Also, it logically follows that, if you are a Division III school and you have no scholarships, then size would mean something because a school of 1,000 would not have the pull of a school of 10,000. One of the arguments against this was that aggressive recruiting by a hard working coach is the key to success and not size.

I would just like to state this as an example. An aggressive coach at a private school of 1,000 that costs maybe \$7,000 a year to attend went out and worked very hard. He worked against an aggressive coach from a large school that costs one-half of that amount, with 10,000 students. The advantage would certainly be towards the person that had the larger size.

I made a point in the round table that it is sort of like David going after Goliath, and David won. We were all happy he won because we like to see the underdog win, but in that particular instance he had got his size and I don't think all of the smaller schools have that advantage.

**R. Bev Vaughan** (Christopher Newport College): Mr. President, a point of clarification on this piece of legislation. Would the sponsor of this legislation please indicate whether the 3,500 is the total number of students or full-time equivalency?

**Mr. Thompson:** Full-time equivalency.

**William P. Dioguardi** (Montclair State College): I think that the philosophy of education has changed quite a bit since that survey. I know that, even though we may have over 7,000 enrolled, there could be 1,000 housewives who have enrolled in our programs. There could be another 1,000 who have work to do each day, and when our doors close at 4 o'clock, they run as fast as they can.

Right now, I just got a phone call from my secretary and she said there was no one there. She said the students are off on a vacation, they will be off until the 25th and there was not much of an attendance at last night's game. So what I am trying to say is definitely the size of the enrollment has nothing to do with the success of the program.

I will tell you why. I went to Notre Dame when there were 3,500. We had a national championship team. I went down to Widener College, outside of Philadelphia, three weeks ago. They beat us. I am on the Division III Basketball selection committee. A small private college won that. Now, I really think that whoever proposed this is way out of line; and they do not understand what is happening today.

**Joe Campanelli** (Knox College): I beg to differ with the gentleman's statement on size not making a difference. I believe it does. I know there was a recent study by the steering committee in terms of the fact that the schools recently, the smaller schools, have done well. I think that is true, and I think that is attributed to the coaches in the small schools and how well they have done.

I think 20 years ago on the high school level the same thing existed. No one thought we needed classifications for high school programs. Size does make a difference, I think. If you look at any state, they have their classifications for that particular reason.

The other point I wanted to make is that we talked earlier about fair share and paying our dues. I think we all voted that in and are willing to pay our fair share. The smaller schools want a fair chance to compete. It is difficult for a school of 1,000 to compete, with everything else being equal, with a school of 7,000 or 8,000.

**Edwin D. Muto** (State University of New York, Buffalo): I speak in opposition to this proposal on three points. The first is that the original NCAA concept did not allow the institutions the right of self-determination based on their philosophy as to the purposes of athletics within the educational objectives at their institution, and then placing their athletic program in competition with institutions of like philosophy.

Secondly, in our institution, which is a large urban one, our athletic policy is compatible with the Division III philosophy; and we have not propagated the direction of our athletic program with the size of our student body.

Lastly, statistical studies that were made by the Division III Steering Committee have shown that over the past five years the average male enrollment of Division III champions has been approximately 1,700. Further, the study has shown that schools with enrollments of 3,600 or less have won approximately 70 percent of the championships in Division III.

To establish an enrollment ceiling would deprive Division III of many numbers with compatible athletic philosophies. I urge defeat of Proposal No. 95.

**Royce N. Flippin Jr.** (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): MIT is one of those 66 Division III institutions that would be inconceivably disenfranchised if this proposed legislation were somehow passed. We had a good discussion of this matter at our Division III round table, and the overwhelming consensus was that this legislation is not an answer to either the problems or solutions for the concerns proposed in this proposal.

So for MIT and all that believe in the philosophy and spirit of Division III, please vote against Proposal 95.

**Bill Huyck** (Carleton College): We have seen a massive influx of sizable state universities in Division III in the Midwest, and these are not passive institutions. Their recruiting is aggressive, and they are very strong athletically. It has created a very inequitable competitive situation there. It coincides with the payment of travel costs to the national championships and has been exaggerated or accelerated by the fact that women's championships have been added into this.

If we don't address this problem now at 3,500, we will have to address it sooner or later at another juncture because it is getting worse. We have to find a way to maintain equitable competition within that group, Division III.

**James C. Stokes** (West Georgia College): Mr. President, I am

concerned that the matter of philosophy has been pretty much criticized; and we have gotten down to the matter of notes. I really feel the status of the athletic program is pretty much predicated on the amount of money that is available to the sports team as far as competition is concerned.

It appears that the large state universities or large state colleges, which have to accept virtually every student that comes in, are being discriminated against. It is difficult for us to raise tuition in order to accommodate funds for athletics, whereas the private schools have a distinct advantage in that they may raise tuition or raise student fees much easier than we can. It puts us at a distinct disadvantage.

It appears to me that the Division III philosophy is prevalent in the division, and I certainly hope that we continue it that way and do not propose to place institutions simply based on their size. If that is the case, then I anticipate that somewhere along the road restraints will be placed against institutions based on their particular religious affiliation or perhaps the very nature of their institution. I encourage the people to vote against it.

**Judith M. Sweet** (University of California, San Diego): Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in opposition of the amendment. As mentioned earlier, there were very extensive discussions that took place yesterday in our round table, with the conclusion being that the issue facing us is not necessarily one that is dependent upon enrollment size but rather multidivisional status.

Also, as mentioned earlier, the statistics show that the enrollment has not really affected the outcome of the championships and that, in fact, large institutions have performed consistently in concert with their percentage participation in Division III. I feel that it is a philosophical question. The large schools do not necessarily have larger budgets than the smaller schools.

I speak very strongly in opposition to passing this amendment.

[Proposal No. 95 (pages A-62-63) was defeated by Division III.]

#### Tryouts

**Fred Jacoby** (Mid-American Conference): On behalf of the Special Committee on Legislative Review and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 96.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Andrew T. Mooradian** (University of New Hampshire): I move Proposal No. 97, as an amendment to No. 96.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 97 replaces subparagraph (4) in No. 96. It does not allow contact drills, testing against other athletes or athlete; but it does allow physical activity and testing for evaluation of the ability of an athlete.

**Fran Koenig** (Central Michigan University): I would like to speak in opposition to the amendment to No. 96 because I do not feel that it gives the opportunity to truly see the skill of a team-sport athlete in a noncontact sport, which I think No. 96 does give the opportunity for. I would urge defeat of No. 97.

[Proposal No. 97 (pages A-63-64) was defeated by all divisions.]

**Mr. Jacoby:** The intent of No. 96 is to permit tryouts for prospective student-athletes under limited circumstances as were detailed in the proposal. The rationale for the proposal is based on the following:

One, the tryout principle or audition has been successful in the women's program and could be extended to the men's program in the pursuit of a common rule. Two, permitting tryouts would economize and save money in off-campus recruiting. Three, because of the reduction in the size of the coaching staffs, this would necessarily limit the time available in off-campus recruiting.

For example, in some cases a coach may be required to coach in two sports. Now, the examples of the application of the proposal, for example, in the sport of football it would be possible to use the 40-yard dash, which I think most coaches favor, and weights, agility drills, quarterback passing, runouts for any passouts, punters and place kicking. These could all be used in a tryout.

On the other hand, you could not block one-on-one, two-on-two, or scrimmage in any form in the sport of football. However, in basketball it would permit one-on-one, two-on-two or even five-on-five. We would urge you to give serious consideration to the tryout proposal.

**Robert C. James** (Atlantic Coast Conference): For two years, the Recruiting Committee has considered the tryout possibility, and our coaches have been unalterably opposed to it. I think more significantly I would like to call to the attention of the group a letter from Brice Durbin, executive director of the National Federation of State High School Associations:

"The purpose of this letter is to express to you and the NCAA Council in the strongest terms possible the opposition of the National Federation and its executive committee to Proposal 96, which will be considered by the 76th annual Convention. This position to oppose Proposal 96 was overwhelmingly adopted during the National Federation's recently completed midwinter meeting, January 4-6."

Mr. Durbin lists some of the concerns following. It is some three pages in length and I think it would merit repeating to you, but I shall try to briefly call to your attention these points:

"The pressure placed upon high school students participating in tryouts on college campuses will be excessive and unbearable by some students at that stage of development and maturity.

"Two, a large number of a school's students, both boys and girls, participate in more than one sport. A tryout for one sport, while the student is participating in another, would be most disruptive of the high school program in that second sport.

"Three, the possibility of injuries to participants in such tryouts would always be present.

"Four, many state associations have eligibility rules which would affect the continuing eligibility of any students participating in tryouts at colleges. This proposed radical departure from the previous longstanding NCAA tryout rule, without any notice to or input from the representatives of the nation's high schools, seems unusual in light of



the previous negative impact and the effect it will have upon high school programs and students."

Mr. President, in light of this strenuous objection by the National Federation, which represents the governing state athletic associations from all 50 states plus the District of Columbia, I should like to move that this proposal be referred to the Association's Recruiting Committee for proper review and consultation with the high schools.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 96 (page A-63) was referred to the NCAA Recruiting Committee for study. The motion was approved by all divisions.]

**Richard H. Perry** (University of Southern California): Mr. President, I want a special privilege, please. In looking at that proposal, I see no reference as to what obligation and/or option the university would have in the event that the student-athlete trying out were injured. Would the institution be liable for providing knee surgery, for instance, and/or would we have the option of providing knee surgery in the event of injury?

I see no reference to that, and I would like to ask if the committee would make reference to that option in their observations.

**Mr. James:** Yes, that has been one of the principal objections of our coaches. They are very much concerned with the injury and how it will be treated and the liability of the institution for that injury.

#### Recruiting Contacts

**Keith Broman** (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 98.

[The motion was seconded.]

The sponsors feel that this legislation would provide something that could be verified by investigation. We think the present rule is very difficult to enforce, and this is a realistic step that responsible coaches could adhere to in good conscience.

**Richard Bay** (University of Oregon): Mr. President, we at Oregon oppose the adoption of Proposal Nos. 98 and 99. Simply put, we feel they are excessive and serve only to add significantly to the expense and pressure of recruiting for our institution. Perhaps a more important reason to defeat these proposals, however, is the position taken on them by the National Federation of State High School Associations.

On behalf of the high school federation, allow me to quote briefly from a letter to the NCAA from Mr. Brice Durbin, executive director of the National Federation.

"Proposals to increase the number of contacts by permitting neither a specified or unlimited number on high school facilities merely opens up a new legitimate area for recruitment. In the judgment of the executive committee and the national council of the high school federation, such increased contacts will become a disruptive force on high school academic and athletic programs. If the argument in support of additional contacts on the high school facility is that the current bump situation is, as a practical matter, unlimited recruiting contacts, then the position of the National Federation membership is as follows:

There should be a greater commitment by the NCAA membership to abide by the current contact rule. Also a more direct enforcement of the contact rule that would result in stringent penalties for violators would be a better approach rather than to liberalize existing recruiting legislation."

In short, Mr. Durbin is saying that these proposals are unacceptable to him and would be disruptive for our nation's high schools. I would urge, therefore, their defeat.

[Proposal No. 98 (page A-64) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

#### Recruiting Contacts

**Keith Broman** (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): I move Proposal No. 99 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

Now, I move that Proposal No. 99 be committed to the Recruiting Committee for study.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 99 (pages A-64-65) was referred to the NCAA Recruiting Committee for study. The motion was approved by Division I-A Football.]

#### Women's Basketball Recruiting

**Edward W. Malan** (Pomona-Pitzer Colleges): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council and the Special Committee on Legislative Review, I move adoption of Proposal No. 100.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of Proposal No. 100 simply is to exempt Division I and Division II women's basketball programs from limitations of Bylaws 1-2-(a) and 1-3 during the period of August 1, 1981, to August 1, 1985, especially as it regards contact within evaluation periods for prospective student-athletes.

There are two reasons for this legislation. The first is that the transition period from August 1, 1981, to 1985 has been established by the Association to allow women's programs to move toward NCAA rules or to allow time to modify those rules so that they accommodate both men and women adequately.

Secondly, the high school basketball season for girls does not fit the recruiting and evaluation periods as now established for men's basketball. It would seem that some more appropriate date would be better, and the time should be allowed for those dates to be worked out.

**Dolores Copeland** (University of Houston): I speak, Mr. Chairman, in opposition to the motion. To be very brief, it does not allow us to move toward common rules; and, too, it makes an exception for women's basketball, which at this point in time is very unclear and unjustifiable. I urge defeat of the proposal.

**Ronald M. Brown** (University of Texas, Austin): The current men's rules on this subject are both restrictive and reasonable. The existing AIAW rules are even more restrictive. To permit women's basketball programs under NCAA jurisdiction to engage in such contacts, when



neither existing men's programs or other women's programs to do so, appears unreasonable.

Such a situation would give license to unfair recruiting advantage and upset competitive balance in women's basketball and would significantly increase recruiting costs for these programs. I urge you to vote against the proposal.

**D. Alan Williams** (University of Virginia): Without regard and looking at this between Part A and Part B, as a member of the committee, I would like to call your attention to the fact that, in a substantial number of states, particularly among the smaller high schools, women's basketball is played at a different time of the year than men's basketball, either in the fall or the spring.

It is exceedingly difficult to come up with a common rule at this particular time. We recognize that I think that this has presented us with a particular problem that we would like to have time to work out, as we see the way in which women's high school basketball develops as well as women's basketball in this organization.

**Judith R. Holland** (University of California, Los Angeles): I speak in favor of the motion. I will call your attention again to the fact that it is during the transition period only. We have not had time really to evaluate what the impact of that recruiting restriction would have on us. There are many states where women's basketball is played at varying times of the year. I think it is premature to impose that rule on the women.

[Proposal No. 100 (pages A-65-66) was approved by Division I, 155-96, and by Division II.]

#### **Basketball Recruiting Season**

**Fred Jacoby** (Mid-American Conference): I think the passage of No. 100 would make No. 101 moot. We withdraw it.

[Proposal No. 101 (page A-66) was withdrawn.]

#### **Basketball Recruiting Season**

**C. Donald Cook** (Fairfield University): In behalf of the six member colleges of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 102.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, Proposal No. 102 calls for a change in the starting and closing dates for recruiting contacts in the sport of men's basketball. Specifically, this proposal calls for a change in the starting date from August 1 to September 1 and a closing date from October 1 to November 1. Such a change would greatly help our basketball coaches, who encounter difficulties in contacting high school coaches, guidance counselors and frequently even the prospective student-athletes during the month of August when school is not in session.

Except for altering the recruiting dates, this amendment does not in any other way alter the time frame with the permissible contact period.

**David Rice** (Fordham University): I rise in support of Amendment No. 102. The economic burden facing our coaches to locate high school

coaches and recruits during the month of August, which is the time of the year when both these parties possibly are geographically separated, is imposing undue expenses on our program. I, therefore, urge support of Amendment No. 102.

[Proposal No. 102 (pages A-66-67) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

#### **Basketball Evaluation Periods**

**Mary M. Zimmerman** (University of South Dakota): In light of the passage of Amendment No. 100, the University of South Dakota and the other sponsors of Amendment No. 103 would like to withdraw it.

[Proposal No. 103 (page A-67) was withdrawn.]

#### **Institutional Letter of Intent**

**Kenneth G. Germann** (Southern Conference): I move adoption of Proposal No. 104.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is a request of our basketball and football coaches. The current language leaves us at a bit of a disadvantage. In addition, the passage of this would clear up the problem with midyear admits and what to do with those and how to process those fees.

**Robert L. Waters** (Western Carolina University): I am athletic director and football coach at Western Carolina University. I would like to speak also in favor of this proposal. We feel it would allow an institution to commit the prospect in writing and would allow a group of institutions in a conference or group to make a written commitment and to have the people within this group honor this commitment.

We also feel that it would be cost saving, because it would allow us not to have to continue to recruit against these people until the National Letter of Intent date, which is far too late and we feel probably will continue to be. I urge its adoption.

**Ernest C. Casale** (Temple University): Mr. President, I would like to speak in support of this amendment also, for three reasons. Under present legislation, an institution that does not belong to the National Letter of Intent gains none of the advantages of the National Letter of Intent but, at the same time, is required to abide by the signing date.

Secondly, this institutional letter of intent is really binding only on the institution and not on the prospective student-athlete. That prospect can still be involved with any other institution.

Thirdly, the National Letter of Intent is not an NCAA program; and, as such, it always has been, in my opinion and the opinion of others, illegal. It would appear to me, then, that forcing institutions that do not belong to the National Letter of Intent to abide by any of its regulations is just compounding the error of our legislation. I urge the passage of the amendment.

**Wayne Duke** (Big Ten Conference): I spoke to this point a year ago when the legislation was adopted to abandon intraconference letters of intent and institutional letters of intent in favor of one common signing date. At the meeting of the Collegiate Commissioners' Association,

when this matter was presented, I indicated when the history is written regarding intercollegiate athletics certainly the great tributes will be paid to the late Howard Grubbs, who was executive director of the Southwest Athletic Conference, and Bill Davis, the founders of the voluntary interconference letter of intent, which Ernie Casale has indicated has operated outside the aegis of the NCAA but, nonetheless, is one of the most successful programs in alleviating recruiting pressures.

Currently, there are more than 350 institutions voluntarily enrolled in the interconference letter of intent, a very successful program. For a number of years, Howard Grubbs and Bill Davis were interested in establishing a common national signing date. But in deference to the different recruiting patterns and different geographical sectors of the country, that was never accomplished until last year.

Last year that was accomplished, and it was a gigantic step forward. In my opinion, the adoption of this particular measure would dilute one of the most successful programs in intercollegiate athletics administration. I urge we defeat this proposal.

**Fred Jacoby** (Mid-American Conference): As chairman of the National Letter of Intent steering committee, one thing we wanted was a common signing date for all institutions so they would not be faced with multiple signings in different conferences. We have not even given that an opportunity, and we are trying to change it already. We ought to give it a chance for a year or two, and I think having one signing date will prove successful. We urge your defeat of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 104 (pages A-67-68) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

#### Recruiting—Publicity

**Douglas W. Weaver** (Michigan State University): Mr. President, this proposal also originated in the Recruiting Committee and its subcommittee, made up of football and basketball coaches. Our Conventions in previous years have shown a great concern about the publicity surrounding signing of student-athletes. In Bylaw I-4, we see some prohibitions and we have limited publicity, we have limited media outlets and we have limited press conferences, receptions and dinners. As well as with recruiting, we have limited the publicity of a visit and limited appearances on radio and TV shows of coaches.

Proposal No. 105 is a national extension of this concern for the publicity surrounding the signing of an athlete. This is for football only in Division I-A. If you take the head football coach out of the signing and recruiting process, in some measure it reduces the pressure and the publicity.

Mr. President, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 105.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Joseph V. Paterno** (Pennsylvania State University): Joe Paterno from the real world. (Laughter) I hope we still have a sense of humor left. This proposal is a great proposal in many ways. As the head football coach who would come down to the wire with maybe 18 or 19 youngsters who are going to sign the letter at the time—the first time

they can or within a day or two—all of them expect personal attention from the head coach. If you go and sign one, you have just about got to sign all the top ones.

You are in an airplane for about 48 hours. You spend an awfully lot of money. You accomplish nothing. The youngster has already made up his mind to come to your place in most cases. As a rule, that would take away some of the degrading parts of being a head football coach with a lot of youngsters having to have you come, as if they are just something so special that your program could not succeed without them and you must be there.

This would be a great move forward. I think most head football coaches would agree with me.

[Proposal No. 105 (page A-68) was approved by Division I-A Football.]

#### Expense-Paid Visits

**D. Alan Williams** (University of Virginia): On behalf of the NCAA Council, the Recruiting Committee and the Special Committee on Legislative Review, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 106.

[The motion was seconded.]

For some time, we have been operating under a rule of six paid visits per student-athlete. In recent years, there has been increasing concern about the cost of this. There has been increasing concern from high schools about the amount of time students have been away from classes. There has been concern that this number of six is really not a workable number and not a viable number.

We have been at it long enough to have some experience. A survey last year on Division I football players indicated that most of them had two or four paid visits. The number six was rarely used, and it seemed to be among those who visited schools in certain choice climates at opportune times of the year. Under any circumstances, it now appears that five visits in football and basketball would be very workable numbers and that it would not work an injustice against those who have been concerned that they might not be visited first. It appears that most students make up their mind in considerably less time than that, and it would cut down particularly on the itinerating nature of many of the recruits.

**Cecil N. Coleman** (Midwestern City Conference): This has come up a couple of times in the past several years, and the arguments have not changed any at all. Your institution is still protected, as is the entire program, by the number of paid visits that you are allowed to bring in these youngsters from high school.

What it does, it does disenfranchise a certain segment of the membership, because a sixth visit, many times, is the one that they will use to come to the middle or lower class of the Division I membership and give them an opportunity. Six and five, there is not a lot of difference; but it does give a lot of us the opportunity to be competitive by keeping the six.

**Robert M. Sweazy** (Texas Tech University): I would also like to

speak in opposition to this amendment. In my opinion, this amendment accomplishes nothing constructive or beneficial. What it does not do is to provide any economic benefit to the institution. If the number of expense-paid visits is reduced to five, an institution will not decrease the number of visiting recruits, but rather they will invite recruits who otherwise might not have been invited, thereby keeping constant the total number of visitors.

What this amendment will do is to limit the basis on which the recruit will make one of the most important decisions of his life, namely, the selection of a university. It will also provide these institutions with highly successful or visible football programs or those near tourist attractions of interest but of little educational value with an unwarranted recruiting advantage. It will also allow recruits to miss one day of class, provided Friday is used for travel. That is hardly educationally significant.

Therefore, if your institution is not located in a city by the sea or if your football program does not apparently fall in the top ten, I think it would behoove you to vote no on this amendment.

**Charley Scott** (University of Alabama): There is a mathematical problem that anyone in here who is a mathematician can take a look at in regard to this particular situation. I have not been able to get anyone other than myself to understand that problem, but if you deal with those numbers you can find that the maximum possible average number of visits is 3.17. If one boy uses six, that means that some other boy would have .34. It is not possible to have an average of six.

[Proposal No. 106 (page A-68) was approved by Division I, 146-121, and by Division II.]

#### **Complimentary Meal**

**Robert C. James** (Atlantic Coast Conference): On behalf of the Recruiting Committee and the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 107.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, this proposal has been before the Association in previous years; and I should like to call to your attention that the last two years we have tried to expand the Recruiting Committee by some 40 coaches to discuss this matter. I feel this is one of the problems that they feel is most difficult for them in the recruitment operation.

We are listing with you four serious concerns that they feel exist in this present legislation. First, the difficulties encountered when other individuals who accompany the prospect cannot be provided with a complimentary meal. Two, the recruiting advantage that results from the unlimited number of meals that may be provided by institutions located in major metropolitan areas. Three, the difficulty in defining, on a uniform basis, the on-campus student dining facilities that may be utilized for this purpose. Four, the cost factor that results in provisions of some meals. We ask your support of this amendment.

**James Jarrett** (Old Dominion University): Mr. President, I rise to support this amendment. I feel very strongly that the current legisla-

tion provides urban institutions with an urban recruiting advantage, and I ask your support of this legislation.

**Robert A. Latour** (Bucknell University): This legislation has been on our books, I would guess, for about six years. Frequently, it has come before this body to change it. It has been defeated each time. I am speaking in opposition to this motion.

Incidentally, our institution is a suburban institution. Our college community is about 8,000 population, so we would not be considered an urban institution.

I find it very difficult to find equating a trip or visit to a campus in which, in most cases affecting our institution, recruits come to our campus for five-hour or six-hour visits and we try to pay them the common courtesy of a meal in our cafeteria, equating that with an expense-paid trip for example, 500-mile plane trip and 48 hours of wining and dining on a campus.

The comparison makes no sense to me. I think that this legislation that we have on the books is a good one. I don't think that it has been exploited, and I urge defeat of this motion.

[Proposal No. 107 (page A-69) was approved by Division I, 133-131. A subsequent motion to reconsider was defeated (see page 141).]

#### **Recruiting—Entertainment**

**Robert C. James** (Atlantic Coast Conference): I move adoption of Proposal No. 108.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Recruiting Committee and Council, I submit this to you. It certainly needs no explanation.

[Proposal No. 108 (page A-69) was approved by Division I and defeated by Division II, 48-77, and by Division III.]

#### **Continuation of Championships**

**James Ciszek** (University of Lowell): Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 109.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Ferdinand A. Geiger** (Stanford University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 109-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, Proposal No. 109-1 is actually a substitute motion for No. 109, which we believe is unrealistic and too far-reaching. There are economic realities and difficulties in the land, and many institutions are dropping sports. We recognize that the NCAA programs have long been basic to the American Olympic effort; but we have seen that six Olympic men's sports, for example, have less than 100 NCAA members sponsoring them, and three of them have 60—approximately 60 or less—and are very close to losing their championship status in the Association. I feel we need to encourage these sports. They are indeed basic to the Olympic effort; and they are water polo, skiing, volleyball, fencing, sports such as those.

This amendment to the amendment allows us to continue these championships through the 1983-84 academic year, prior to the 1984 Olympic Games in Los Angeles. I hope you will vote in favor of this amendment to the amendment.

**Charley Scott** (University of Alabama): For the Executive Committee, I express opposition to this idea in general, so I am speaking to both the amendment to the amendment and to the amendment.

At the time of the consideration of this Executive Regulation, the Executive Committee adjusted the percentage to grandfather in all existing championships. We now have seven percent of 750, 53 institutions, as the minimum. That seems to be a small number. The membership is going up; but some of these sports that we mentioned are being dropped by institutions, so that the total number of institutions that are participating is going down.

A number of championships represent drains on the financial resources of the Association. A provision exists in the legislation for the continuation of those championships where there are revenues that exceed the expenses. Now, this proposal, or these proposals, will extend those championships with small numbers of participants and little or no revenue and will represent a continuing drain on the financial resources of the Association.

**Mr. Geiger**: Mr. President, just in response I would say that, for example, in the sport of water polo there will be a water polo championship next year. We are only asking for a one-year extension of the water polo championship. Hopefully, we can recruit some more schools to have water polo as a varsity sport within that time.

The other one that is in some difficulty is skiing, and again that would be continued for only one more year. I don't think that is a huge drain on the resources of the Association.

**Edward S. Steitz** (Springfield College): I support this proposition. However, I want to indicate to you I was a member of the Executive Committee and the Special Committee on Championships Standards that brought this to the attention of the Executive Committee so far as the percentage is concerned. I believed it then and I believe it now.

However, a problem has been caused as a result of us moving into this in gymnastics, Division II gymnastics in particular. If we hold this to the count, this will be the last year that we have Division II national gymnastics championships for Division II and Division III institutions. When the gymnasts came to our campus, they were totally unaware this was happening, that they wouldn't be able to enjoy the visibility of being involved in championships as a gymnast.

We have one or two people that are hoping to make the Olympic team. So, I think this grace period is not going to really financially destroy the NCAA, and I would hope that you would support this proposition.

**Mr. Ciszek**: I am in accord with the amendment to the proposition and just throw this out from the standpoint of economics—that the Division II gymnastics championship has been self-sustaining and, therefore, passing this proposition would not be a burden on the NCAA.

**Mr. Scott**: Mr. Chairman, a point of information. The question has been raised over here. There was mention that the amendment to the amendment is really a substitute motion. Is that correct?

**President Frank**: No, this is an amendment to the amendment. The statement was made, but consider this as an amendment to the amendment.

[Proposal No. 109-1 (pages A-70-71) was approved.]

[Proposal No. 109 (pages A-69-70) was approved as amended by Proposal No. 109-1.]

**Davis Weathersby** (Mississippi Valley State University): Mr. President, since I was on the prevailing side, I would like to move reconsideration of Proposal No. 107.

[The motion was seconded and defeated.]

### Eligibility for Division I Championships

**Seaver Peters** (Dartmouth College): Mr. President, on behalf of the Executive Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 110.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 110, or the impact of it, is currently in place, pending action by this Convention. The Executive Committee was anxious to hear the will of the Convention and to have them determine its nature. We have heard from a number of Division II and Division III institutions that they favor terminal championships in those divisions. They feel their athletes peak, perform well in their respective divisional championships and then feel compelled to go on to a Division I championship. And generally speaking, I would say with the exception of the sport of wrestling, the results have been a letdown and somewhat anticlimatic.

Divisions II and III athletes competing in the Division I championship do not score, but they impact on the scoring by displacement and by precluding some Division I athletes from attending the meet or competition and perhaps scoring. I want to say also the Divisions II and III athletes get their expenses, of course, to the Divisions II and III championships. The institution has to pick up the tab for them to go to Division I, and again it is expensive and they feel compelled to do so.

The only other point I would make is that, as some have said, some in Division I, that it gives Division II and Division III kind of the best of both worlds. They can recruit young men to come to their institutions and tell them if they do well they do have a potential to go on to the Division I championship.

If this is passed, Divisions II and III championships would be terminal. The Executive Committee and Special Committee on Championships Standards urge careful consideration of this proposal.

**Joe L. Singleton** (University of California, Davis): Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against this motion. In 1975, this Convention voted to divide into three different divisions, Division I, Division II and Division III. One of the gentlemen's agreements that was made at that time was that Divisions II and III would have access to Division I championships. Since that time, this has come up in the Executive Committee



several times. We voted not to have an economic impact, but the schools pay their own way for the athletes to advance forward.

We would urge that the Convention vote this down and look at Proposal No. 111 as maybe some relief for Division I people. But because the scholarship grants are low, we intend to pick up some athletes that have a chance to win on the Division I level. We would like for a few of those students to have an opportunity to go up and compete. We urge you to defeat this motion so we will have that opportunity.

**Lowell D. Lukas** (Central Connecticut State College): Mr. President, I am a former member of the NCAA Golf Committee and also a former member of the Division II golf subcommittee. Although my comments will be in reference to golf, perhaps they will also be significant to the other sports that will be affected by this legislation.

I urge the defeat of Proposal No. 110 for the following reasons: First of all, if, in fact, we are going to crown an individual champion, say, in the sport of golf, I would think it would be a true champion if everyone were afforded the opportunity to participate. The present legislation allows for this.

Second, there are available various NCAA-sanctioned all-star competitions with the sole criteria being the place of finish of underclassmen in the Division I championships. Recently, Division II and Division III participants have met that criteria, qualified, participated and were able to reap the benefits of this all-star competition. I am speaking of such competition as the U.S.-Japanese all-star competition, the Sun Carnival all-star competition. For this reason, also, I would like to urge the defeat of this proposal.

Last, the advancement is voluntary. If an institution finds it is a financial hardship to advance an individual or if that individual would choose for some personal reason not to want to advance, he has that opportunity. I urge the defeat of this proposal.

**Ade L. Sponberg** (North Dakota State University): I am a member of the NCAA Wrestling Committee. While I can't speak for the committee, I can assure you there is no opposition to the Division II and Division III wrestlers advancing to the national Division I championship. In fact, the formula that is used to determine qualifiers is carefully calculated based on past performance. So their position in that tournament is earned.

We, as has been indicated, don't cost the Division I championship any money, because that rare individual in our institutions that does qualify for Division I is paid for by his own institution. An example is our 1980 heavyweight wrestler, a Division II wrestler, who gained great exposure by participating in the Division I tournament.

Under this legislation, if Division I's intent is approved, that exposure would not be possible, so we again urge your defeat.

The other thing is that I have a problem with the effective date. We have athletes on our campus that came there, as has been indicated before, with the idea that if they were good enough they could participate in Division I's championships. I urge its defeat.

**Charles L. Crawford** (State University College, Brockport): Many of the points have already been made but I would like to urge the defeat of No. 110, which does continue to allow the advancement opportunity, and to point out to the membership that Divisions II and III, I believe, have recognized some of the problems that continuing this practice presents and have offered, in Nos. 111 and 112, some relief from that.

If No. 110 is passed, they would become moot. We urge that this opportunity be continued and modified in the way that it is proposed in Nos. 111 and 112 but that it not be eliminated entirely, in fairness to our athletes who have an advancement opportunity.

**Laurence C. Keating Jr.** (Adelphi University): Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in opposition to No. 110 and in support of Nos. 111 and 112. In our institution, we have made a determination on many occasions not to send athletes who did qualify through Division II championships on to Division I for purposes of competition. No one has ever argued that a team champion in Division II could successfully compete in a Division I championship.

This is not the case with individual sports. Many athletes go unrecruited by Division I institutions and successfully compete and improve their performances at the Divisions II and III levels. We have had athletes at our institution to go on to Division I championships and place in those events. I would urge your support of Proposal Nos. 111 and 112 and the defeat of No. 110.

**Richard H. Perry** (University of Southern California): I would speak in support of Proposal No. 110 on the basis that it seems to me that many student-athletes who opt to attend a Division I institution do so with the understanding they may be somewhat marginal in their sport, but they are willing to take the risk of competing against what they perceive to be the best in competition that the NCAA has to offer.

If they opt to take that risk and fail, there is no other alternative for them. They are a fourth-place finisher or a nonscorer or whatever. Whereas, an individual who opts not to take that risk is given the opportunity at a later time to advance, if they happen to be successful, and move on to another opportunity.

It seems to me if we allow this to happen, for Divisions II and III to move forward, that the Division I championship would certainly require that that person who elected to take the risk who ends up, say, one of the first three nonscorers in the NCAA swimming, for instance, ought to have the option of dropping down and participating in Division II championships to see if they might not be champions at the Division II level.

**Corey Van Fleet** (Oakland University): I would urge the Convention to provide a vehicle, either by No. 110 or 111, whereby a Division II or Division III athlete capable of representation in Division I be maintained. There are only a very few each year. The money will be found by the institutions involved if they are indeed deserving.

In the sport of swimming, the all-America team is picked out of only the Division I championship. Further, I would like to call your attention to the fact that the Olympic Committee criteria for the

selection of the Olympic coaches is based on whether or not your athletes compete and place in the Division I championships.

**Chalmer G. Hixson** (Wayne State University): I rise in opposition to No. 110 and in support of Nos. 111 and 112, and I think for one additional reason to those that have been expressed earlier. If No. 110 is enacted, there will be a group of athletes who will give up on taking their education in a Division II or a Division III college or university, athletics is so important to them. If they think they have a chance to compete in that Division I championship and you will lock them out, they are going to go to a Division II or Division I university even though they wanted to take their education at a Division II or a Division III school.

I don't think you ought to force them out into the Division I schools for their education if they really wanted to get their education in a Division II or Division III school. The displacement gets its relief in No. 111 and No. 112. I urge you to defeat No. 110.

[Proposal No. 110 (pages A-71-72) was defeated.]

#### **Eligibility for Division I Championships**

**Chalmer G. Hixson** (Wayne State University): I will move adoption of Proposal No. 111.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal reduces the number of qualifiers, and I emphasize the word "qualifiers," to move on to the Division I championships. It goes from six to two and gives relief to the Division I athletes for displacement.

[Proposal No. 111 (pages A-72-73) was approved.]

#### **Eligibility for Division I Championships**

**Donald M. Russell** (Wesleyan University): Mr. President, I wish to move adoption of No. 112. In the debate preceding the vote on No. 110, it was pointed out that Divisions II and III had entered these amendments in order to reduce the number of people moving on from our tournaments to Division I. Again, I won't read the numbers, but basically what it does is reduce our representation to one person in each event. Therefore, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 112.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 112 (page A-73) was approved.]

**Lowell D. Lukas** (Central Connecticut State College): Mr. President, I would like a clarification on No. 111 that just passed. If I read that correctly that means there are two individuals in Division II, say, in the sport of golf, and two individuals from Division III that would advance. Is that right?

**President Frank:** Just one.

**Mr. Lukas:** I am referring to Proposal No. 111.

**President Frank:** Yes.

**Mr. Lukas:** Then we just passed Proposal No. 112, which allows for four individuals in Division II and one individual in Division III. The

question is, in Division II, are we advancing two individuals or four?

**President Frank:** You are advancing two, and you have combined the changes that you passed in Nos. 111 and 112.

**Mr. Lukas:** I am still not clear, sir. We will use lacrosse as an example.

**President Frank:** There are two in Division II and one in Division III, and this would be combining those.

**Mr. Lukas:** Thank you, sir.

**P. LaVerne Sweat** (Hampton Institute): Mr. President, before Proposal No. 113, I would like to move to reconsider Proposal No. 92. I voted on the prevailing side.

[The motion was seconded and defeated.]

**Norris A. Edney** (Southwestern Athletic Conference): Mr. President, while I do not stand to challenge the chair on Nos. 111 and 112, I would like you to give me an interpretation of that again. I failed to understand how the chair is taking part from one and the other, to take only the part that deals with the lower numbers, to move them into the approved motion, since the two do not deal with that.

**President Frank:** That was not done, except that the net effect is that you would have two people or two participants out of Division II being qualified to move up and one from Division III. I don't understand the question about moving from one motion to the other.

**Mr. Edney:** I am sorry if I have confused my words. If you look at golf, I simply do not understand and wish you would explain golf as an example of what you are saying.

**President Frank:** Again I repeat myself, you have to look at the original numbers; and you are changing the numbers in Divisions II and III. The numbers are changed in Division III to one and Division II to two.

**Ernest C. Casale** (Temple University): There was some discussion here, and I think that we can clarify it. I think that if No. 111 passes, and that becomes a part of the bylaws, that you have new numbers. Now, you work with No. 112 and you get new numbers for Division III.

#### **Women's Indoor Track Championships**

**P. LaVerne Sweat** (Hampton Institute): Mr. President, on behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 113.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 113 would establish a National Collegiate Women's Indoor Track Championship, effective as of the 1982-83 academic year. There are a sufficient number of institutions that sponsor the sport of indoor track to warrant establishment of an indoor track championship. At the present time, there has been a sufficient number of members who have indicated an interest in having their women's indoor track and field program conducted by the NCAA.

[Proposal No. 113 (pages A-73-74) was approved.]

### **Women's Soccer Championship**

**Elizabeth A. Kruczek** (Fitchburg State College): Mr. President, in behalf of the Council and the Special Committee on Legislative Review, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 114.

[The motion was seconded.]

According to the criteria set forth in Section 1 there is a sufficient number of institutions who would sponsor women's soccer to offer a National Collegiate Women's Soccer Championship. Soccer is a growing sport; and, furthermore, many institutions continue to express an interest in having their women's program affiliated with the NCAA in this sport.

Therefore, this proposal would offer that opportunity. The establishment of a championship would necessitate the forming of a six-person committee selected from Divisions I, II and III and at-large to formulate the policies and procedures for the NCAA soccer championship.

[Proposal No. 114 (page A-74) was approved.]

### **Women's Skiing Championships**

**President Frank:** Proposal No. 115 is out of order and does not meet the requirements for establishing a championship as set forth in Executive Regulation 2-1-(a).

**Joseph R. Geraud** (University of Wyoming): I move the adoption of Resolution No. 115-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

As stated in the resolution, it has been drafted in recognition of the fact that there does not appear to be a sufficient number of women's skiing teams to satisfy the existing requirements of the executive regulation. With the concept in mind that a skiing meet will be held for the men, this resolution would authorize a pilot program that would include the entry of women's teams and competitors.

The resolution would not authorize the expenditure of any Association funds or any transportation funds authorized for those people who qualify. It is the hope of the proponents of this legislation that such a pilot program might point the way to some solution for the sports such as skiing, which remains popular, and also reflect our effort to obtain some type of championship for our women skiers.

**Robert F. Riedel** (State University College, Geneseo): I am a member of the Executive Committee, and I would like to speak in opposition to this. I think the guidelines are established for starting championships for the Association, and I think we should abide by the guidelines that now exist.

[Resolution No. 115-1 (page A-75) was defeated.]

### **Institutional Eligibility for Championships**

**Carl C. James** (Big Eight Conference): I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 116.

[The motion was seconded.]

I believe the intent of Proposal No. 116 is very clear. You will remember, last January Division I voted to conduct championships for women. Following the vote, Walter Byers stated at a news conference, and I quote, "The votes on governance and championships constitute a historic commitment by the NCAA to enhance opportunities for women."

Mr. Byers further added that he expected the decisions to give fresh and renewed impetus to intercollegiate athletics at all levels. "We are going to watch women's athletics rise to a new plateau," Mr. Byers predicted.

I agree with those statements and, for that reason, I request that you approve this proposal, which will insure all sections of the country to be truly represented in women's championships and which, in my mind, will give women's programs the renewed impetus that Mr. Byers predicted.

**Judith R. Holland** (University of California, Los Angeles): I rise in opposition to this motion. I don't believe that championships are necessarily scheduled to include all areas of the country but to include the very best teams. If you read this very closely, the words that really bother me are, about the fourth line up "or any other at-large teams."

This severely disrupts the scheduling or the selection of teams whereby a lot of independent schools—and that is what we largely find now in women's athletics, that schools are independent—will not be selected until the schools have banded together in a conference. When we look at the quality of that championship, I think it severely disrupts women's championships.

**Eugene M. Haas** (Gettysburg College): Mr. Chairman, last year I trust you will recall those of us who attended this Convention had similar legislation to inhibit the action of the selection committees. I speak against this and represent at least the Division III Football Committee in so doing. I would like to just relate an incident that occurred last year. My point is that I would hope this would be defeated, and I would hope that then legislation would be introduced next year to eliminate the law on the books that ties the hands of the selection committees.

Our golfers at Gettysburg College last year had one or two days in the sun and won our league championship. I received calls from two members of the Golf Committee asking me to decline the selection if we were selected, which our golfers had in effect earned. To be perfectly frank, I don't think our golfers were that good. As I say, they had one day in the sun. Also, I was called by a representative of the NCAA office, asking if I would be willing to step aside and withdraw Gettysburg from consideration. I think this is the kind of pressure we do not need. I said that there is no way I can decline the nomination unless I want to be tarred and feathered by the student-athletes on our campus.

I would ask the Convention to place this aside and also to do the same next year for the other side of our program.

**Charles D. Henry** (Big Ten Conference): I would like to make a statement and then ask a question. I think the Big Ten Conference



favors this type of legislation, yet the sports committees and the Executive Committee allowed the conference to remain intact. However, we have had trouble with subsection (h) under this same regulation as a proposed subsection (i).

For instance, two years ago, the University of Iowa could not understand why the Golf Committee wanted to send it back to Region 5. The coach was a little upset because he felt he had only one man who would move up, Julius Boros Jr.; and he did. Last year, however, we were a little concerned with the gymnastics. We felt that we are fairly close in that seven-state conference, but we were in three different areas.

Iowa couldn't understand possibly how they had to compete to get to the nationals against the top three teams in the country, Nebraska, Iowa State and Oklahoma, when they are in the Big Ten Conference. Ohio State was placed in the East, clearly the best team in the East, 14 and 0; and it had beaten its Pennsylvania friends who were selected for nationals before them.

At the Big Ten Conference, one point separated the first three teams. Ohio State was third and could not be selected under the same regulation (h) until Illinois was selected. So I guess the question I want to ask the sponsor of this legislation is, can they guarantee that the women in our conference will remain intact and not split up a seven-state conference into two or three geographical areas?

**Mr. James:** Mr. President, it is difficult for me to answer that. Let me say that yesterday Joe Geraud, in reporting on the activities of the Council last year, indicated that we would be moving forward in women's athletics, that the Council had appointed committees on sports and that these committees were functioning well. I follow the work of the sports committees, certainly; but I have some concern as I look at what is happening in the sports committees.

For example, in the sport of women's basketball in Division I, we now have 13 conferences that have received automatic qualification. Three of these conferences have been granted waivers under Bylaw 5. They have not been in existence two years. They are newly created; and yet now they have automatically qualified for the most prestigious women's event, the Division I basketball championship.

On the other hand, we only have one qualification given to Division I in tennis and only two in softball. I have a problem with the philosophy of the sports committees in not perpetuating the growth of women's athletics. Now, we have heard all day, we have granted waivers to all sorts of rules for women's athletics; and then we come to the greatest opportunity, an opportunity for those championships.

The Big Eight this week will play our 10th basketball championship under the name of the Big Eight Conference. We have talked about the transition period between 1981 and 1985; I don't want to get involved in that. I want those conferences committed to women's athletics to have an opportunity to let these teams go on to compete in the national championships. For example, it is my understanding that this year there were 20 teams selected to compete in the Division I volleyball championship. Eight of those came from one state. Mr. President, I

urge acceptance of this proposal.

**Mary Roby** (University of Arizona): Mr. President, women have spent approximately 10 years struggling to be recognized as talented athletes rather than token people who are put somewhere because of representation. We are interested in the growth of athletics, but we are more interested, at the national level, in competition among the very most talented teams of the nation.

I think if you place this in the hands of the sports committees, they will recognize the talented teams in all conferences. I urge you very strongly to defeat the motion.

**D. Alan Williams** (University of Virginia): As a member of the Special Committee on Legislative Review, I would like to move that this matter be referred to that committee for consideration.

[The motion was seconded and approved, and Proposal No. 116 (pages A-75-76) was referred to the Special Committee on Legislative Review.]

### **Resolution: Division I Men's Basketball**

**Bob Vanatta** (Trans America Athletic Conference): I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 117.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of the resolution is to maintain the format of the past three years in Division I basketball championships, whereby all Division I allied conferences would be granted automatic qualification for future tournaments. The tournament in the past three years, in the opinion of many people here today, has been the most interesting, the most exciting and certainly the most lucrative in the history of the NCAA. These increases have been due, to some extent, to the bracket, which has given all Division I allied conferences the automatic bid.

It is a bit difficult to understand why a change should be made in such a highly successful venture. I would hope that each of you would give No. 117 a yes vote, in the name of fair play.

**Ferdinand A. Geiger** (Stanford University): Mr. President, I am speaking on behalf of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee, in opposition to Proposal No. 117. Automatic qualification has been a difficult and controversial subject in Division I basketball.

However, I quote Executive Regulation 2-6-(b)-6, "Prior to recommending that a conference receive automatic qualification, a governing sports committee shall ensure that the conference competition in the applicable sport is of sufficient quality to warrant automatic qualification."

We recognize that automatic qualification to the NCAA Division I men's basketball tournament is most attractive. However, one can question if it is the purpose of the Association's tournament to provide the viability of an allied conference as asserted in the third "whereas" clause in Proposal No. 117. There mere existence of an allied conference is not in itself a quality standard for entrance into what has become one of the nation's premier athletic events.

Proposal No. 117 is contrary to the fundamental principles of a



performance standard for qualification for a national championship. Such standards exist in every other championship. In the past deliberations, the alternative to showing sufficient quality has been expansion of the bracket. A majority of the committee believes that 48 teams and 28 automatic qualifiers best serves Division I membership.

It is a danger, Mr. President, for the Association to get involved in tournament management by resolutions submitted on the floor of the Convention. The tournament committee is responsible and responsive in meeting its charge to manage one of the most successful competitions in the history of sports. Its action in establishing that no more than 50 percent of the 48-team bracket be filled by automatic qualification has been approved by the NCAA Executive Committee.

Proposal No. 117 establishes no standards and opens wide the gates by ordering the Executive Committee "to study methods to accommodate all champions of automatic-qualifying conferences in all future Division I Men's Basketball Championships." This encouragement of attrition, we feel, should be of some concern to Divisions II and III. I urge the Convention to defeat Proposal No. 117.

**G. B. Wyness** (West Coast Athletic Conference): Mr. Chairman, I have to agree in great respect with what my good friend Mr. Geiger just said. I also have great respect for the basketball committee and the work of that committee. However, I rise to urge your support of Proposition No. 117 just on a matter of principle.

If the banded universities are a part of a particular division and there is a national championship, then this champion ought to be allowed the opportunity to participate. You are talking about three or four teams that are maybe, in fact, marginal teams from one year to another within the 24 to 28.

I do not urge you to necessarily consider a 64-team tournament; but it would be a simple matter to adjust the present 48-team tournament, if the committee felt that they were, in fact, watering down what is one of the best entertainment shows in the United States today, by simply pairing up some teams that are considered to be rated lower than others and, at the same time, thereby giving national opportunities for each conference in Division I to be fully participatory in the national championship.

**Joseph H. McMullen** (Towson State University): I also have great respect for the basketball committee and the Executive Committee and what they are trying to do. I speak in support of this, and I would like to draw it to the attention of Divisions II and III that they will be greatly affected by what happens in this vote.

Personally, I remember when I was in the position that two or three games with Division I opponents greatly enhanced our program. Geographically, the games were attractive even though we were in a lesser division. Economically, the games were attractive. But, with the computerized program, it is going to necessitate the conferences on the featheredge of making the 24 or not making the 24 to require their membership not to schedule games with Division II or Division III members because of the penalty of 100 points for each game played. That 100 points, subtracted by even an opponent of yours playing

Divisions II and III teams, could make the difference between your being in the 24 that qualify or the few that did not qualify. I think it closes any opportunity for upward mobility; and, more important, many Divisions II and III schools traditionally and economically feel it is to the good of their programs to play one, two or three Division I teams.

I urge the support of this resolution on one other point. The computer program is great, but I am an engineering grad of Brown University and a mathematics grad. I took the program to computer experts, and found that one or two games can decide who is in and who is out of the tournament. The statistics are mathematically insignificant. In fact, using the sheets that were circulated, the 24th conference and the 25th conference both have ratings of .4558. The next conference that wouldn't get to go has a rating of .4469, which is a .0069 difference, less than one game difference.

So I urge Divisions II and III not to ignore this resolution, because it is very important to their programs as well as those of the border conferences.

**Arliiss L. Roaden** (Tennessee Technological University): Mr. President, I speak in favor of this resolution. The substance of this resolution is that conferences that meet Division I criteria have the right to have their champions compete for the national championship. There is no other single issue, as far as the Ohio Valley Conference is concerned, that is more important than this one.

The automatic bid is our single most valuable asset. The conference is not a newcomer. It has been in existence for approximately 35 years; and it has enjoyed the automatic bid since 1955, although it certainly was not formed for the purpose of getting an automatic bid. It is a comprehensive conference, offering more than eight championships for men and five championships for women. So our purpose is not to achieve the automatic bid. Our purpose for forming is to provide high quality athletics.

If it is concluded that the number of participants in the championship are or may become excessive, then the criteria whereby conferences move to Division I membership might be strengthened. It is just terribly important that Division I conferences be assured that their champions can get a crack at the national title.

If that opportunity is denied for just one year, and I don't want to be dramatic, but it could deal a death blow to the future of the basketball program in the conference because of the negative impact, particularly on recruitment and also on scheduling. So I hope that the concept of this resolution will be supported; that is, if a conference meets the criteria for Division I, its champion deserves the right to compete for the national title.

**Kenneth A. Free** (Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference): Mr. Chairman, I speak in support of Proposal No. 117. We feel the same as our other comrades, and we hope that each Division I qualifying conference can compete against the other fine champions and the selected independents who are not champions.

**David R. Gavitt** (Providence College): Mr. President, as chairman

of the NCAA Men's Basketball Committee, yesterday at the Division I round table I gave a report on the tournament committee's recommendation to the Executive Committee. As this is an all-division vote, it may bear repeating today.

Certainly, the tournament committee has been sensitive to the need of maintaining the key to a delicate balance in the NCAA basketball championship over the period of the last decade. I think, during this period, we have seen an unmitigated growth in Division I schools, some 48 over the last eight years. We have seen some automatic-qualification growth from 16 conferences to the present-day 28, in a period of some six years.

We have wrestled over the past three years with this growth, and you indeed as an Association wrestled with some of the criteria of this unprecedented growth at the special Convention in St. Louis. In most cases, you tried to strengthen that criteria. I think what we are looking at really is that we feel we have been responsive to the overall needs of the membership.

We first struck on the problem of the proliferation of the automatic qualifiers that could lead to an imbalance situation in the strength of the overall tournament and the championship as far back as 1979. The rating percentage index that Joe referred to--and I understand Joe's background from my neighboring school Brown, but I wish when we invited all allied conferences to come to our meeting when we communicated that, that he would have come forward as Ken Germann and some others did at that time to make some constructive criticisms. At that time, I think we could have accomplished it.

We really do believe that the program we have put forward, with the computer program analyzing winning and losing, the strength of opposition that you play and the success of the schedule that your opponents play, really is a very fair way to strike a creative balance among some of the stronger teams in this country and among some of the stronger independents, who could be very disenfranchised if the bracket were to go completely out of balance in regard to automatic qualification. And it still gives an opportunity to each and every one of those conferences whose basketball program is new and is on the improve, by reaching a 24 automatic and 24 at-large selection. In doing so, we think we have the flexibility to stick to the proper number of teams from each area.

It has been interesting to us over the past couple of years that the 16 first-round games, which involve mostly teams that were automatic qualifiers, usually the record of our seedings in that first round holds up very well. It is when we get to the second round and beyond that we see the so-called upsets in the bracket. This has been something that has made the tournament very exciting.

So, on behalf of the tournament committee, who has spent three years and an awful lot of diligent time working very hard for all of our constituents and all of our conferences, I would support No. 118 and would recommend it to you as a fairer, healthier way to approach the continued good health of the National Collegiate Basketball Championship.

**James E. Delaney** (Ohio Valley Conference): I would like to take a few minutes of the Convention's time. I urge adoption of Proposal No. 117 because it generally affirms the percentage of conference automatic qualifiers relative to the total field that has occurred in at least each of the last 30 tournaments and specifically affirms the formula used by the tournament committee for the past three tournaments.

In 1978, the tournament committee reemphasized the importance of the automatic qualification by expanding the tournament to 40 teams, upon the condition that all eligible Division I allied conferences would receive an automatic qualification. The tournament is presently at 48 teams. The tournament attendance and average session attendance for the 1981 and '82 tournaments exceeded the average of any previous decade. The TV rights fees will exceed \$47 million over the next three years.

Historically, the conference automatic-qualifying concept has been the core of the selection process. For example, between 1951 and 1981, 836 teams received bids to the tournament; 499, slightly less than 60 percent of the total bids extended, have gone to conference direct as automatic qualifiers. This policy has helped many conferences grow, and yet this policy has also come to cause the excluding of some strong independents and reducing of multirepresentation from some strong basketball conferences.

The basketball committee and Executive Committee have discussed their rationale for the 50 percent rule in light of deterring the proliferation of Division I members' coaches. The question I raise is whether these committees should attempt to remedy this situation by adopting a procedure that may eliminate a bid from an Ivy League, a Big Sky, a Mid-American, a Southern, a PCAA, an MCAC, an SWAC, a WAC or several other conferences. If the membership wants proliferation stopped, let's pass more exacting standards for entrance into Division I, but let's not attack the problem by imprecise and ineffective methods of denying some four Division I conferences an automatic bid toward the most prestigious athletic tournament.

If No. 117 is not passed, each year some four Division I basketball champions will receive a sanction that is more significant than some punishment meted out by the NCAA Committee on Infractions. Division I allied conferences not guilty of anything but an off-competitive year should not be subject to such a fate.

**John W. Sawyer** (Wake Forest University): This is a resolution, which is not subject to vote by divisions. However, it affects only the Division I tournament. Under our customary and unofficial fair-play idea, I would suggest that only the Division I schools vote.

**Mr. McMullen:** Mr. President, a point of order. I believe the last statement was in error. This does not just affect Division I. This greatly affects Division II and Division III. In fair play, let's let them all vote. Let's urge them to vote.

**President Frank:** It was only a suggestion.

[Resolution No. 117 (page A-76) was approved.]

[Resolution No. 118 (pages A-76-77) was withdrawn.]

### **Resolution: NCAA Council**

**Charles H. Samson** (Texas A&M University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Resolution No. 119-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This resolution notes the Council's view that Proposal No. 119 is a constructive attempt to obtain adequate representation on the NCAA Council for certain membership interests. The resolution also states that the Council believes, however, that neither the present representation formula for Council positions nor Proposal No. 119 adequately addresses the interests of Division I-A and Division I-AA Football, as presently structured by the special Convention in December.

Through this resolution, the Council is proposing that it submit legislation for consideration at the 1983 Convention that would restructure the Council according to the following five guidelines:

First, expand the Council to approximately 32 to 40 members by incorporating, all or in part, the existing division steering committees.

Second, retain the current 2-1-1 representation ratio among Divisions I, II and III.

Third, assure guaranteed representation for each Division I-AA Football conference, each of the four Divisions I-AA Football regions and other major interests within Division I.

Four, provide that the membership of each division elect its own members of the Council.

Fifth, establish a partially federated Council meeting concept, by which the division units would meet separately to act upon matters pertaining exclusively to their respective divisions and the entire Council to consider issues of overall Association policy and matters of interdivision interests.

I urge your approval of this resolution.

[Resolution No. 119-1 (page A-77) was approved.]

**Carl C. James** (Big Eight Conference): On behalf of the sponsors of Proposal No. 119, we applaud the resolution just presented by the Council and adopted by the membership. Proposal No. 119 was submitted by a group of eight state universities committed to excellence in education and in athletic activities for women and men. The Big Eight Conference now looks forward to having a representative on the Council and, therefore, withdraws Proposal No. 119 in favor of the Council's resolution.

[Proposal No. 119 (pages A-77-78) was withdrawn.]

[Proposal No. 120 (pages A-78-80) was withdrawn.]

[Proposal No. 121 (page A-80) was withdrawn.]

[Proposal No. 122 (pages A-80-81) was withdrawn.]

### **Resolution: Academic Trust Fund**

**M. Maceo Nance Jr.** (South Carolina State College): Mr. President, Resolution No. 123 was submitted to this august body in good faith, attempting to establish another vehicle to allow our respective institutions to maximize assistance to our student-athletes, to be more than

mildly cognizant of the fact that it is our student-athletes who bring us great visibility and credibility and, last but not least, generate considerable amount of funds to our institutions.

However, in the haste in developing this resolution, some unfortunate terminology was used that we understand now would exclude some athletes involved in some member conferences, specifically in line 2 of the last paragraph, which could be interpreted to mean scholarship athletes only. This was not our intent, and, therefore, we wish to withdraw this resolution with the understanding that we will resubmit at a later time to include all athletes.

[Resolution No. 123 (pages A-81-82) was withdrawn.]

### **8. REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEES ON COMMITTEES**

**President Frank:** I will now call the chair of the Women's Committee on Committees to give the report.

**Emma J. Best** (University of District of Columbia): Mr. President, I move acceptance of the report regarding the various sports committees, as recommended by the Women's Committee on Committees.

[The motion was seconded, and the report of the Women's Committee on Committees was approved as presented.]

**President Frank:** We will now call upon the chair of the Men's Committee on Committees.

**Fred Jacoby** (Mid-American Conference): On behalf of the Men's Committee on Committees, I would like to recommend the adoption of the committees that have been recommended.

[The motion was seconded, and the report of the Men's Committee on Committees was approved as presented.]

### **9. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

**President Frank:** I will now call upon the chair of the Nominating Committee, Jack Davis.

**John R. Davis** (Oregon State University): Mr. President, on behalf of the members of the NCAA Nominating Committee, I wish to present the following slate for vice-presidents of the Association: For district vice-presidents, to reelect Andrew T. Mooradian, University of New Hampshire, Division I, District 1; Richard W. Burns, University of Texas, El Paso, Division I, District 7. For the three vice-presidents-at-large, to reelect Elizabeth Kruczek, Fitchburg College, Division III, District 1; Elmer W. Yoest, Otterbein College, Division III, District 4; Judith M. Brame, California State University, Northridge, Division II, District 8.

Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I move the election of this slate.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

**President Frank:** I would like to make one announcement. At this Convention, the number of registered voters and the total registration both are Convention records. [Editor's note: The final figures were 643 registered voters and 1,315 total registrants.]

[The Convention was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.]

## Appendix A

### 76th Annual Convention LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words which appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words which appear in **bold face** are to be added. All proposed amendments shall be effective as indicated; the term "Immediately" means that the legislation, if adopted, becomes effective upon adjournment of the Convention. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1981-82 NCAA Manual. All votes were by show of paddles unless otherwise indicated. Only those proposed amendments upon which the 76th annual Convention took some action appear in this appendix. Amendments to amendments follow immediately the proposal to which they relate.]

#### TOPICAL GROUPINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 76th ANNUAL CONVENTION

<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>General Topic</i>
1 through 11	Consent Package--Constitution
12 through 31	Consent Package--Bylaws
32 through 35	Playing and Practice Seasons
36 through 41	General
42 through 44	Academic Requirements
45 through 49	Television
50 through 53	Amateurism
54 through 67	Eligibility
68 through 81	Financial Aid
82 through 95	Membership Classification
96 through 108	Recruiting
109 through 118	Championships
119 through 122	Governance

#### Consent Package--Constitution

Proposals 1 through 11 are offered as a "consent package" of constitutional amendments considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature. Any objection from an active or voting allied member to any item contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The remainder of the package will be acted upon with a single vote, requiring a two-thirds majority approval for adoption.

#### NO. 1 AWARDS

**Constitution:** Amend Article 3, Section 1-(i)-(2), page 15, as follows:  
[All divisions, common vote]

"(2) In paragraph (i) above, the awarding institution may



provide multiple awards annually in recognition of a student-athlete's accomplishment; but the total value of any and all awards received during a particular academic year by an individual student-athlete may not exceed \$100, except when combined with the permissible senior awards, in which case the total value of all awards received by a senior student-athlete may not exceed \$200. In paragraphs (iii) and (iv) above, the awarding institution, conference or other organization may not provide more than one award each in recognition of a student-athlete's accomplishment, and the cost of any single award may not exceed \$150."

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To clarify the number and value of the awards a student-athlete may receive under Constitution 3-1(i).

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Nos. 1 through 11 were approved as a constitution consent package.

## **NO. 2 HIGH SCHOOL ALL-STAR GAMES**

**Constitution:** Amend Article 3, Section 9-(a), pages 22-23, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(a) The student-athlete shall be denied the first year of intercollegiate athletic competition if:

"(1) Following completion of high school eligibility in the student-athlete's sport and before enrollment in college, the student-athlete was a member of a squad which engaged in an intrastate all-star football or basketball contest that was not specifically approved by the appropriate state high school athletic association or, if an interstate all-star football or basketball contest that was not specifically approved, by the National Federation of State High School Associations or all of the state high school associations involved NCAA Council, or if the student-athlete participates in more than two approved all-star football contests or two approved all-star basketball contests.

"(2) The Council of the Association may designate a committee to act in its place or in place of any state association that declines to assume the jurisdiction described in this paragraph."

**Source:** NCAA Council (All-Star High School Games Committee).

**Intent:** To delete the reference to approval by the National Federation of State High School Associations or by all of the state high school associations involved for interstate games.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 1.

## **NO. 3 HIGH SCHOOL ALL-STAR GAMES**

**Constitution:** Amend Article 3, Section 9-(a), pages 22-23, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(a) The student-athlete shall be denied the first year of intercollegiate athletic competition if, following completion of high school eligibility in the student-athlete's sport and before enrollment in college, the student-athlete was a member of a squad which engaged in any all-star football or basketball contest that was not specifically approved by the appropriate state high school athletic association or, if interstate, by the National Federation of State High School Associations or all of the state high school athletic associations involved, or if the student-athlete participates in more than two approved all-star football contests or two approved all-star basketball contests. The Council of the Association may designate a committee to act in place of any state association that declines to assume the jurisdiction described in this paragraph. [Note: During the period between August 1, 1981, and August 1, 1985, student-athletes participating on a member institution's women's intercollegiate basketball team shall be exempt from the provisions of this paragraph.]"

**Source:** NCAA Council (All-Star High School Games Committee).

**Intent:** To exempt women's basketball student-athletes from the Association's high school all-star basketball games restrictions during the period between August 1, 1981, and August 1, 1985.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 1.

## **NO. 4 SPORTS SPONSORSHIP**

**Constitution:** Amend Article 4, Section 2-(g), page 27, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(g) With regard to active members, to sponsor and conduct a representative schedule in a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports which involve all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females, according to the level of intercollegiate competition of a conference or an individual institution, with at least one sport conducted in every sport season. An institution which sponsors no all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females shall be eligible for active membership provided it sponsors a minimum of four all-female sports, with at least one in each sport season."

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To affirm that an institution which sponsors no all-male or mixed teams of males and females may be eligible for active membership in the NCAA provided it sponsors a minimum of four all-female sports, with at least one in each sport season.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 1.

## **NO. 5 SPORTS SPONSORSHIP**

**Constitution:** Amend Article 4, Section 2-(g), page 27, by adding new

subparagraph (2), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(2) The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may waive the requirement that an active member must conduct at least one sport in every sport season if the institution is precluded by its academic calendar and climatic conditions from conducting a sport in a particular season."

Source: NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To permit Council waivers of the requirement that an active member must conduct at least one sport in every sport season when the institution is precluded by its academic calendar and climatic conditions from conducting a sport in a particular season.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 1.

#### NO. 6 COUNCIL TERMS

**Constitution:** Amend Article 5, Section 1-(a), pages 31-32, by adding new subparagraph (4), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(4) Whenever necessary to adjust the membership of the Council so that vacancies will occur in the proper sequence, members may be appointed for less than full terms. Members appointed to fill vacancies shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of that term. In these instances, members who serve more than one-half term shall be considered to have served a full term."

Source: NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To affirm the existing interpretation that a Council member serving two years or less shall not be considered to have served a term on the Council.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 1.

#### NO. 7 NCAA COUNCIL

**Constitution:** Amend Article 5, Section 1-(a)-(4), page 31, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(4) Among the 20 vice-presidents, 10 (including at least two women) shall represent Division I members, five (including at least one woman) shall represent Division II members and five (including at least one woman) shall represent Division III members."

Source: NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To specify the allocation by division of the minimum number

of positions for women on the NCAA Council.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 1.

#### NO. 8 VOTING PRIVILEGES

**Constitution:** Amend Article 5, Section 6-(h), page 36, by adding new subparagraph (7), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(7) An active or allied member with no men's athletic program shall not be permitted to vote on issues affecting only men's athletics, and an active or allied member with no women's athletic program shall not be permitted to vote on issues affecting only women's athletics. Effective August 1, 1985, an institution that does not affiliate its women's program with the NCAA shall not be permitted to vote on issues affecting only women's athletics."

Source: NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To place in the NCAA constitution the portion of the 1981 governance plan specifying voting privileges for institutions or conferences that sponsor only men's athletics or only women's athletics; further, to specify that, effective in 1985, an institution not affiliating its women's program with the NCAA would not be permitted to vote on women's athletic issues in the NCAA.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 1.

#### NO. 9 PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE

**A. Constitution:** Amend Article 5, Section 6-(i), page 36, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(i) The rules contained in the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, shall be the parliamentary authority for the conduct of all meetings of the Association and shall be the deciding reference used in case of parliamentary challenge in all instances to which they apply and in which they are not superseded by this constitution, the bylaws or any special rule of order the Association may adopt."

"(1) The Association may adopt special rules of order not inconsistent with the constitution and bylaws by a two-thirds majority of the delegates present and voting at any annual or special Convention."

"(2) Proposed special rules of order and amendments to existing special rules of order shall be subject to the same procedural requirements for previous notice and amendment as prescribed in Constitution 7."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Article 11, Section 2, page 117, by adding new paragraph (a), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) For the conduct of an annual or special Convention of the Association, the Council shall act as the convention program committee, the convention resolutions committee and the convention committee on standing rules. The Executive Committee shall act as the convention arrangements committee."

C. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 6-(d), (e), (f) and (g), page 36, by deleting the present language and substituting the following, relettering subsequent paragraphs:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(d) Representation at annual or special Conventions of the Association shall be as follows:

"(1) Each active member and each allied member with voting privileges as specified in Constitution 4-3-(b)-(2) shall be entitled to one vote and may be represented by one to four accredited delegates.

"(2) Each allied member without voting privileges and each associate and affiliated member shall be entitled to one accredited delegate without voting power.

"(3) Member and nonmember institutions and organizations are authorized to send visiting delegates who shall be without voting power."

D. Special Rules: Add Special Rules of Order, following page 133, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

#### SPECIAL RULES OF ORDER

"Section 1. Participation in Meetings. Privileges of the floor and the right to active participation in the proceedings of any annual or special Convention of the Association shall be as follows:

"(a) Any of the four accredited delegates authorized in Constitution 5-6-(d)-(1) to represent an active or allied member with voting privileges may actively participate in the business proceedings.

"(b) The single accredited delegate authorized in Constitution 5-6-(d)-(2) to represent an allied member without voting privileges may actively participate in the business proceedings.

"(c) Any member of the NCAA Council or the NCAA Executive Committee and the chair (or a committee member designated to speak for the chair) of an NCAA committee listed in Bylaw 11 who are not representing a member as an accredited delegate may actively participate in the business proceedings.

"(d) Visiting delegates authorized in Constitution 5-6-(d)-(3) shall not actively participate in the business proceedings.

"Section 2. Convention Program and Arrangements. (a) The program of the business session of an annual or special

Convention of the Association shall be established by the Council, acting as the convention program committee. Once adopted by a majority vote of the Convention, the order of business established in the program may be changed or suspended only by a two-thirds vote of the members present and voting.

"(b) All other arrangements for a Convention of the Association shall be made by the NCAA officers and executive director, subject to the direction and approval of the Executive Committee, which shall serve as the convention arrangements committee.

"(c) In applying Constitution 7 and Bylaw 12, the presiding officer may permit changes in the wording of proposed amendments of a purely editorial nature or to correct typographical errors.

"(d) In the consideration of groupings of related amendments or amendments to amendments, the Convention shall consider first the proposal which contemplates the greatest modification of the present circumstance, followed by the other proposals in the order of decreasing modification. Once a proposal in such a grouping is adopted, those that follow ordinarily will become moot.

"Section 3. Effective Dates and Reconsideration. (a) Unless otherwise specified, all amendments to the constitution or bylaws shall become effective on the first day of August following adoption by the Convention. Those specified as being effective immediately shall become effective upon adjournment of the Convention.

"(b) Prior to adjournment of any Convention, an affirmative or negative vote on a proposed amendment to the constitution may be subjected to one motion for reconsideration of that action by any member that voted on the prevailing side in the original consideration.

"(c) Prior to adjournment of any Convention, an affirmative or negative vote by any division on a proposed amendment to the bylaws may be subjected to one motion for reconsideration of that action by any member of the division that voted on the prevailing side in the original consideration.

"Section 4. Voting. The methods of voting at an NCAA Convention shall be by voice, paddle, roll call and secret ballot, in accordance with the following procedures:

"(a) The presiding officer shall determine the use of voice or paddle voting. In the taking of a voice vote, if the presiding officer is in doubt, or upon request for a division of the assembly by any member eligible to vote on the particular issue, the presiding officer shall retake the vote by a show of paddles.

"(b) In the taking of a vote by show of paddles, if the presiding officer is in doubt, or upon the request of any member eligible to vote on the particular issue, the presiding

officer shall order the vote to be counted.

"(c) Voting by roll call or by secret ballot shall be conducted only when so ordered by a majority of the eligible voters present and voting, following the making of an undebatable motion to vote in that manner. If both a roll-call vote and a secret ballot are moved on a particular issue, the vote shall be taken first on whether to vote by roll call."

Source: NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To reorganize the presentation of NCAA Convention procedures and parliamentary considerations in the constitution and bylaws, to eliminate such content from the executive regulations and to establish special rules of order, as recommended by Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised. [Note: If this proposal is adopted, Constitution 7-5 and 7-6, Bylaws 12-5 and 12-6 and all of Executive Regulation 1 will be deleted.]

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 1.

## NO. 10 CHAMPIONSHIPS CRITERIA

**Constitution:** Amend Article 5, Section 7-(e) and (f), page 37, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(e) A National Collegiate Championship for which any active member institution in good standing is eligible, regardless of its division [per Bylaw 9-6-(b)], may be established by majority vote of all members present and voting at an annual Convention, subject to the requirements, standards and conditions regarding the required number of members sponsoring a sport as prescribed by Executive Regulation 2-1, which may be amended only at an annual Convention.

"(f) Each division may establish a championship for a particular sport in that division by majority vote of the members of the division present and voting at an annual Convention, subject to the requirements, standards and conditions regarding the required number of members sponsoring a sport as prescribed by Executive Regulation 2-1, which may be amended only at an annual Convention."

Source: NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To clarify that the provisions of Executive Regulation 2-1 deal only with sport sponsorship requirements for establishment of NCAA championships.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 1.

## NO. 11 DEADLINES FOR SUBMISSION OF DOCUMENTS

**A. Constitution:** Amend Article 7, Section 1-(a), page 40, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(a) This constitution may be amended at any annual or special Convention by a two-thirds majority of the delegates present and voting, provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted to the secretary of the Association by written mail or wired transmission received at the NCAA national office by not later than November 1 or by certified or registered mail (any amendment received after that date must be postmarked by not later than October 25) preceding an annual Convention, or 60 days preceding a special Convention."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Article 2, Section 2-(m), page 58, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(m) Before the ensuing contest may be certified, the management of a certified game must submit to the Postseason Football Committee by April 1 an audited financial report of the immediate past game, and the report must be received at the NCAA national office by mail or wired transmission not later than April 1 before the ensuing contest may be certified (any report received after that date must be postmarked not later than March 25); further, if a contest is certified but is not held that season, the certification shall lapse."

**C. Bylaws:** Amend Article 2, Section 3-(f), page 59, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) The management of each certified game must submit to the Extra Events Committee an audited or notarized financial report of the immediate past game before an ensuing contest may be certified. All materials in the sport of football must be received at the NCAA national office by mail or wired transmission not later than April 1; any report received after that date must be postmarked not later than March 25. in the sport of football and All materials in the sport of basketball must be received at the NCAA national office by mail or wired transmission not later than December 1; any report received after that date must be postmarked not later than November 24. in the sport of basketball. Failure to submit the appropriate information by those dates may result in withdrawal of certification."

**D. Bylaws:** Amend Article 5, Section 6-(f)-(2), page 87, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(2) A Division II member institution which desires to exceed the Division II maximum awards limitation in a given sport or sports shall file a declaration of its intent to be exempt from that limitation with, and the declaration must be received at the NCAA national office prior to by mail or wired transmission not later than June 1 (any declaration received after that date must be postmarked not later than May 25) preceding the academic year for which it seeks the exemption, and such institution shall then be governed by the appropriate Division I legislation governing maximum awards for that year."



**E. Bylaws:** Amend Article 9, Section 1-(f)-(1), page 103, as follows:  
[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) The institution shall submit its request for a waiver to the Association's executive director, with the request to be signed by the institution's chief executive officer and received in the NCAA national office by **mail or wired transmission** not later than September 15; **any request received after that date must be postmarked not later than September 8**. The request shall include pertinent information supporting the institution's request. It shall be the institution's responsibility to distribute that information to the chief executive officer, faculty athletic representative and director of athletics at each member institution in the preferred division, as well as the executive officer of each allied member of that division, **postmarked** not later than December 1."

**F. Bylaws:** Amend Article 9, Section 3-(c), page 105, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) A member, in petitioning under the terms of (a) or (b), shall submit its request to the Association's executive director on a form approved by the NCAA Council, and the form must be received in the NCAA national office by **mail or wired transmission** not later than June 1; **any request received after that date must be postmarked not later than May 25**. If the Classification Committee determines that the member has met all applicable membership criteria of the division as set forth in Bylaw 10 and has operated in conformity for a period of two years preceding June 1 with all other bylaw requirements of the division as they pertain to the sport in question, the Classification Committee shall declare the applicant eligible to participate in said sport in the division effective the September 1 which the applicant selects as its effective date. The institution must continue to be classified in that division for that sport for a minimum of three years. When the institution's reclassification was the direct result of the creation of a new division or subdivision, the Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant exceptions to the three-year requirement if it deems that the institution's circumstances warrant such action."

**G. Bylaws:** Amend Article 9, Section 4-(a), page 106, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) The institution shall notify the Association's executive director on a form approved by the NCAA Council, and the form must be received in the NCAA national office by **mail or wired transmission** not later than June 1; **any form received after that date must be postmarked not later than May 25**. If the Classification Committee determines that the member has met all applicable membership criteria, as set forth in Bylaw 10, of the division to which it intends to transfer and has operated in conformity for a period of two years preceding June 1 with all other bylaw requirements of the division, the member shall be transferred to the new division effective the September 1 following

submission of the petition or a subsequent September 1 which the applicant selects as its effective date. The institution must continue to be classified in that division for a minimum of three years. When the institution's reclassification was the direct result of the creation of a new division or subdivision, the Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant exceptions to the three-year requirement if it deems that the institution's circumstances warrant such action."

**H. Bylaws:** Amend Article 10, Section 1-(h)-(1), page 110, as follows:  
[Division I-AA football only]

"(1) Such institution shall file a declaration of intent with the NCAA executive director *prior to*, and the declaration must be received at the NCAA national office by mail or wired transmission not later than June 1 (any declaration received after that date must be postmarked not later than May 25) preceding the applicable academic year."

**I. Bylaws:** Amend Article 12, Section 1-(a), page 132, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) These bylaws may be amended at any annual or special Convention by a majority vote of the delegates present and voting, provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted to the secretary of the Association by *written, mail or wired* transmission received at the NCAA national office by **not later than November 1 or by certified or registered mail (any amendment received after that date must be postmarked by not later than October 25) preceding an annual Convention, or 60 days preceding a special Convention**."

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To specify that certain documents must be postmarked by the appropriate date if they are received at the NCAA national office after the specified deadline.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 1.

## **Consent Package—Bylaws**

Proposals 12 through 31 are offered as a "consent package" of bylaw proposals considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature. Any objection from an active or voting allied member to any item contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The remainder of the package will be acted upon by a single vote, with a majority vote required for approval.

## **NO. 12 PRECOLLEGE EXPENSE—EXCEPTIONS**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 1, Section 9-(b), pages 53-54, by deleting subparagraph (1), renumbering subsequent paragraph, as follows:  
[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) The NCAA Council has approved the U.S. Military Academy's tutorial preparatory program as operated at Braden's School, Cornwall-on-Hudson, New York, on the following bases:

"(i) The school will accept prospective students regardless of athletic ability.

"(ii) The U.S. Military Academy will not expend any funds under its control and jurisdiction for paying the educational costs of prospective student-athletes at Braden's School.

"(iii) The Delafield Foundation, a nonprofit outside organization, may collect funds from alumni and other friends of the academy to pay the educational costs of student-athletes attending Braden's School.

"(iv) The Braden's course for prospective student-athletes will be limited to a period of six weeks in the late winter or spring of the candidate's senior year of high school.

"(v) No prospective student-athlete will be enrolled at Braden's School without the approval of the principal of the prospect's high school.

"(vi) No candidate who attends Braden's School under the sponsorship of the Delafield Foundation will be obligated to attend the military academy."

**Source:** NCAA Council (U.S. Military Academy).

**Intent:** To delete references to Braden's School and the Delafield Fund.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Nos. 12 through 31 were approved by all divisions as a bylaws consent package.

#### **NO. 13 POSTSEASON FOOTBALL-HARDSHIP**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 2, Section 2-(f), pages 55-56, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) The eligibility rules governing individual participation shall be as demanding as those governing participation in NCAA-sponsored meets and tournaments, except that a student-athlete granted an additional year of competition by the student-athlete's conference or institution for reasons of hardship is eligible for participation."

[Subparagraphs (1) and (2) unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To specify that the requirements for granting a student-athlete an additional season of eligibility for postseason football contests for reasons of "hardship" shall be as demanding as those set forth in Bylaw 5-1-(d)-(2).

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 12.

#### **NO. 14 CONFERENCE CHAMPIONSHIP FOOTBALL GAME**

**Bylaws:** Amend O.I. 200, following Bylaw 2-2-(p), page 58, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"O.I. 200. An open date refers to a regular weekend playing

date prior to the end of an institution's regular football schedule on which an institution is not playing a game, or a date approved by a two-thirds majority of those Council members present and voting to enable an institution to assist financially in meeting an unforeseen hardship situation resulting directly from the institution's intercollegiate athletic activities. A conference may conduct a conference championship football game (between two institutions whose identities would not be known prior to the beginning of the season) on an open date during the traditional fall season (per O.I. 307), provided the date is listed on the schedules of all conference members and all conference members participate in not more than 10 regularly scheduled football games."

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To clarify that a conference may conduct a conference championship football game on an open date during the football season if all conference members list the date on their football schedules and play not more than 10 regularly scheduled football games.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 12.

#### **NO. 15 WOMEN'S ALL-STAR BASKETBALL CONTESTS**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 2, Section 3, pages 59-60, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 3. College All-Star Football and Basketball Contests. No member institution shall permit its student-athletes (i.e., those who were members of its intercollegiate team in the sport in question) to compete in any college all-star football or basketball contest unless the given contest is certified as meeting the following requirements: [Note: During the period between August 1, 1981, and August 1, 1985, student-athletes participating on a member institution's women's intercollegiate basketball team shall be exempt from the provisions of this section.]"

**Source:** NCAA Council (All-Star High School Games Committee, Extra Events Committee).

**Intent:** To exempt women's basketball student-athletes from the Association's college all-star basketball contest restrictions during the period between August 1, 1981, and August 1, 1985.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 12.

#### **NO. 16 COLLEGE ALL-STAR CONTESTS-FINANCIAL REPORTS**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 2, Section 3-(f) and (g), page 59, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) The management of each certified game must submit to the Extra Events Committee an audited or notarized financial report of the immediate past game before an ensuing contest may be certified. All materials must be received at the NCAA national office by mail or wired transmission not later than April 1 in the sport of football and no later than December 1 in the sport of basketball July 1; any report received after that date must be postmarked not later than June 24. Failure to submit the appropriate information by these dates may result in withdrawal of certification.

"(g) Applications for recertification must be received by the same dates specified in the preceding paragraph for submission of financial reports."

Source: NCAA Council (Extra Events Committee).

**Intent:** To establish a single July 1 deadline for financial reports and applications for recertification of college all-star football and basketball contests rather than separate deadlines for each sport (April 1 in football and December 1 in basketball).

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 12.

#### NO. 17 COLLEGE ALL-STAR CONTESTS

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 2, Section 3-(i), page 59, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(i) The management of the game must agree to comply conduct the game in accordance with the Association's principles for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics as set forth in Article 3 of the NCAA constitution, and interpretations relating thereto."

Source: NCAA Council (Extra Events Committee).

**Intent:** To affirm that a college all-star game must be conducted in accordance with the Association's principles for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 12.

#### NO. 18 WAIVER OF RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 5, Section 3-(e), page 82, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(e) The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may waive the residence requirement set forth in Bylaw 5-1 for a student-athlete who transfers to a member institution after loss of eligibility due to involvement in a violation of Constitution 3-1-(g) or, Bylaw 5-1-(i) or Bylaw 5-6-(b). The Council may waive these requirements only upon a determination of the innocent or inadvertent involvement of the student-athlete in the violation."

Source: NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To provide an opportunity for a waiver of the transfer residence requirement for a student-athlete who transfers after loss of eligibility due to involvement in a violation of Bylaw 5-6-(b) [2,000 rule].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** See No. 12.

#### NO. 19 DIVISION II MEN'S LACROSSE CHAMPIONSHIP

**A. Bylaws:** Amend Article 5, Section 6, pages 83-84, by deleting the following:

[Division II only]

"National Collegiate Division II Men's Lacrosse Championship"

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Article 11, Section 4-(h)-(1), page 126, as follows:  
[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) Four members shall be from Division I, two one members shall be from Division II and, two members shall be from Division III and one member shall be elected at large."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Men's Lacrosse Committee, Division II Steering Committee).

**Intent:** To eliminate the Division II Men's Lacrosse Championship and to change one of the Division II positions on the Men's Lacrosse Committee to an at-large position.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 12.

#### NO. 20 REAFFILIATION OF WOMEN'S PROGRAM

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 8, Section 2, pages 98-99, by adding new paragraph (f), as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) Reaffiliation of Women's Program. If an institution removes its women's program from affiliation with the Association and subsequently applies to reestablish its affiliation, such application must be approved by the NCAA Council. A favorable vote by two-thirds of the Council members present and voting shall reaffiliate the institution's women's program, effective the following September 1."

Source: NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To provide a procedure for reaffiliation of a women's program with the NCAA after the program has been removed from such affiliation.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1985.

**Action:** See No. 12.

#### NO. 21 UNCLASSIFIED MEMBERSHIP

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 9, Section 1-(e)-(3), page 103, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(3) The institution shall identify its preferred division and, during the period of 'unclassified membership,' shall comply with the criteria of that division to the greatest extent possible. It will be bound by all other applicable rules of the Association, will be permitted to vote only on constitutional issues and will be ineligible for NCAA championships and postseason football contests during that period, unless the 'unclassified membership' status is in one sport, in which case its loss of voting privileges and eligibility for championships and postseason football contests shall apply only to that sport."

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To specify that unclassified membership status shall result in ineligibility for postseason football contests.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 12.

## **NO. 22 COMMITTEE MEETINGS—OFFICERS**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 11, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (h), page 117, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(h) The officers of the Association may attend in an ex officio, nonvoting capacity any meeting of any Association committee with the exception of the Nominating Committee and the Committee on Infractions."

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To affirm the traditional practice of permitting the NCAA president and secretary-treasurer to attend a meeting of any NCAA committee.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 12.

## **NO. 23 NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 11, Section 2-(g)-(1), page 118, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) There shall be at least one member from each of the eight geographic districts. Six members, including at least two women, shall be from Division I; three, including at least one woman, from Division II; three, including at least one woman, from Division III, and four members at large. Four of the members shall be the district vice-presidents whose terms do not expire that year; the other 12 members shall not be members of the Council or officers of the Association."

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To clarify which members of the Council may serve on the Nominating Committee.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 12.

## **NO. 24 TOP TEN SELECTION COMMITTEE**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 11, Section 3-(e), page 119, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(e) The College Athletics Top Ten Selection Committee shall be composed of the presidents of the Football Writers Association of America and the United States Basketball Writers Association, three nationally distinguished citizens and one two represented of a member institutions. Two positions shall be allocated for men, two allocated for women and two three unallocated. It shall receive nominations for the College Athletics Top Ten Awards and select the recipients of those awards."

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To increase by one the membership of the College Athletics Top Ten Selection Committee.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 12.

## **NO. 25 COMMITTEES—ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF MEMBERS**

**A. Bylaws:** Amend Article 11, Section 3-(o), page 121, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(o) The International Relations Committee shall consist of nine members, including three positions allocated for men, three allocated for women and three unallocated. The NCAA executive director, or the director's representative, shall be an ex officio member. The committee shall be responsible for the planning and direction of the Association's overall policy in international relations, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee. It shall coordinate and give direction to the membership's interests and activities in the various sports federations of which the Association is a member, the U.S. Collegiate Sports Council and the U.S. Olympic Committee. It shall keep the membership informed through reports submitted to the annual Convention."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Article 11, Section 3-(r), page 122, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(r) The National Youth Sports Program Committee shall be responsible for administering the National Youth Sports Program. The committee shall consist of six representatives from active or allied members of the Association (including two positions allocated for men, two allocated for women and two unallocated, one of which shall be an undergraduate student-athlete who is a varsity letter winner) and an appropriate number of ex officio members representing the Federal government. The NCAA staff member serving as national program director also shall be an ex officio member. Members of the committee may be reappointed without limitation."



**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To delete references to NCAA administrative staff personnel as ex officio members of the International Relations Committee and the National Youth Sports Program Committee.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 12.

#### **NO. 26 INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 11, Section 3, pages 118-124, by deleting paragraph (o), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

*"(o) The International Relations Committee shall consist of nine members, including three positions allocated for men, three allocated for women and three unallocated. The NCAA executive director, or the director's representative, shall be an ex officio member. The committee shall be responsible for the planning and direction of the Association's overall policy in international relations, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee. It shall coordinate and give direction to the membership's interests and activities in the various sports federations of which the NCAA is a member, the U.S. Collegiate Sports Council and the U.S. Olympic Committee. It shall keep the membership informed through reports submitted to the annual Convention."*

**Source:** NCAA Council (International Relations Committee).

**Intent:** To abolish the International Relations Committee.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 12.

#### **NO. 27 POSTGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 11, Section 3-(s), page 122, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

*"(s) The Postgraduate Scholarship Committee shall consist of seven members, including two positions allocated for men, two allocated for women and three unallocated, one of which shall be an undergraduate student-athlete who is a varsity letter winner a former recipient of an NCAA postgraduate scholarship. It shall be responsible for planning and administering the Association's postgraduate scholarship program for student-athletes who have distinguished themselves academically and athletically."*

**Source:** NCAA Council (Postgraduate Scholarship Committee).

**Intent:** To specify that the Postgraduate Scholarship Committee shall include a former postgraduate scholarship winner, rather than a current undergraduate student-athlete.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 12.

#### **No. 28 MEN'S FENCING RULES EDITOR**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 11, Section 4-(a)-(4), page 124, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

*"(4) The secretary-rules editor of each of the following committees may be reelected without restriction: Men's Baseball, Men's Basketball Rules, Men's Fencing, Football Rules, Men's Ice Hockey, Men's Soccer, Men's Swimming, Men's Track and Field and Men's Wrestling."*

**Source:** NCAA Council (Executive Committee, Men's Fencing Committee).

**Intent:** To permit the secretary-rules editor of the Men's Fencing Committee to be reelected without restriction.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 12.

#### **NO. 29 WOMEN'S RULES COMMITTEES**

**A. Bylaws:** Amend Article 11, Sections 4 and 5, by deleting paragraph (r), page 130, and adding new paragraph (m), page 127, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

*"(m) The Women's Swimming Committee shall consist of 12 members, one of whom shall have expertise in diving, and shall be constituted as follows:*

*"(1) At least two representatives from each of the following geographic regions: (i) Districts 1 and 2, (ii) District 3, (iii) Districts 4 and 5 and (iv) Districts 6, 7 and 8;*

*"(2) Six members shall be from Division I, three members shall be from Division II and three members shall be from Division III; one member shall be elected secretary-rules editor.*

*"(3) Committee shall act as one body to formulate playing rules and determine general policies for Divisions I, II and III women's championships in swimming, with division subcommittees composed of committee members from the respective divisions responsible for administering the respective division championships."*

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Article 11, Sections 4 and 5, by deleting paragraph (u), page 131, and adding new paragraph (o), page 127, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

*"(o) The Women's Track and Field Committee shall consist of 12 members and shall be constituted as follows:*

*"(1) At least two representatives from each of the following geographic regions: (i) Districts 1 and 2, (ii) District 3, (iii) Districts 4 and 5 and (iv) Districts 6, 7 and 8;*

*"(2) Six members shall be from Division I, three members shall be from Division II and three members*

shall be from Division III; one member shall be elected secretary-rules editor.

"(3) Committee shall act as one body to formulate playing rules and determine general policies for Divisions I, II and III women's championships in track and field and cross country, with division subcommittees composed of committee members from the respective divisions responsible for administering the respective division championships."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Women's Swimming Committee, Women's Track and Field Committee).

**Intent:** To move the Women's Swimming and Track and Field Committees from Bylaw 11-5 to Bylaw 11-4 inasmuch as both have voted to formulate and maintain NCAA rules for women in those sports.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 12.

#### **NO. 30 COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS--PENALTY**

**Enforcement Procedure:** Amend Section 4-(b)-(4), page 165, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(4) The finding of a violation or questionable practice shall be by majority vote of the members of the committee present and voting. The imposition of a penalty or recommended action shall require the favorable vote of at least four members of the committee when all six members are present and participating in the hearing and shall require the favorable vote of at least three members of the committee when fewer than six members of the committee are present and participating in the hearing."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

**Intent:** To clarify the number of votes necessary for the Committee on Infractions to impose a penalty.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 12.

#### **NO. 31 COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS--PREHEARING CONFERENCE**

**Enforcement Procedure:** Amend Section 12-(b), pages 173-174, by adding new subparagraph (6), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(6) Subsequent to reviewing an institution's written response to an official inquiry, the investigative staff may meet with institutional representatives in order to:

"(i) Clarify the issues to be discussed in the case during the hearing,

"(ii) Make suggestions regarding additional investigation or interviews that should be conducted by the institution to supplement its response and

"(iii) Identify allegations that the staff intends to withdraw."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

**Intent:** To affirm the current operating policies of the NCAA investigative staff.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** See No. 12.

### **Playing and Practice Seasons**

#### **NO. 32 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 3, page 62, by adding the following:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"[Note: During the period between August 1, 1981, and August 1, 1985, member institutions' women's athletic programs shall be exempt from compliance with all provisions of this article except Sections 3-(a) and 5.]"

**Source:** NCAA Council (Special Committee on Legislative Review).

**Intent:** To exempt women's athletic programs during the period from August 1, 1981, to August 1, 1985, from all provisions of Bylaw 3 except the limitations on number of contests and the foreign-com-petition restrictions.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Approved by all divisions.

#### **NO. 33 BASKETBALL--NUMBER OF CONTESTS**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 3, Section 3-(a)-(1), page 65, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(1) Basketball--27 29 for members of Divisions I and II; 26 for members of Division III."

**Source:** Idaho State University; Northern Arizona University; University of Texas, El Paso; University of Utah; Utah State University, and Weber State College.

**Intent:** To allow Divisions I and II member institutions to play two additional basketball games per year.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Defeated by Divisions I and II.

#### **NO. 34 BASKETBALL--NUMBER OF CONTESTS**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 3, Section 3-(a)-(1), page 65, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(1) Basketball—2728 for members of Divisions I and II; 26 for members of Division III."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To allow Divisions I and II member institutions to play one additional basketball game per year.

Effective Date: August 1, 1982.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

#### NO. 35 SOCCER PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(f), page 65, by deleting the present language and substituting the following:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) In the sport of soccer, practice sessions with other intercollegiate soccer teams may be permitted during the preseason practice period set forth in Bylaw 3-1-(a)-(3) and prior to the first regularly scheduled contest (game or scrimmage) and not counted against the permissible number of contests, provided the following conditions are met:

"(1) Such practice sessions are not publicized or printed in schedules by the participating teams;

"(2) Scores, statistics and accounts of the practices are not made public by the participating teams;

"(3) Such practices are conducted without the use of paid soccer officials, and

"(4) Such practices are limited to not more than four."

Source: Adelphi University; Boston University; University of Connecticut; Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science; University of Portland; University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, and three other Division I member institutions.

Intent: To permit up to four preseason practice sessions with other intercollegiate soccer teams without those sessions being counted against the permissible number of contests.

Effective Date: August 1, 1982.

Action: Defeated by all divisions.

---

### General

#### NO. 36 PROPERTY RIGHTS

Constitution: Amend Article 2 by adding new Section 3, page 8, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 3. Property Rights. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this constitution, any provisions of the

bylaws of the National Collegiate Athletic Association or any official interpretation (commonly called 'O.I.'), membership in the Association shall never be conditioned upon the assignment to the Association, or to any officer, agent, employee, committee or council of the Association, or to any other association, corporation, partnership or individual, of the title to, or the right to dispose of or restrict the disposition of the title to, either in whole or in part, any form of property right of a member institution.

"(b) In no event shall any member institution be subject to disciplinary action by the Association for the institution's individual or collective exercise of its property rights outside the Association."

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; University of Oklahoma; Pennsylvania State University; Rice University; Southern Methodist University; University of Texas, Austin, and two other Division I member institutions.

Intent: To clarify ownership of property rights of NCAA member institutions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated.

#### NO. 36-1 PROPERTY RIGHTS

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 36; Constitution 2-3, by adding new paragraph (c), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) The term property rights as used in this section includes all forms of telecasting, cablecasting, televising, radio broadcasting or otherwise transmitting by any media an intercollegiate sporting event of a member institution. Such term does not include matters relating to the regulation of the recruiting of student-athletes; of playing seasons, practice seasons or extra events; of eligibility for NCAA championships; of financial aid awards; or of personnel and squad limitations."

Source: University of Texas, Austin.

Action: Defeated.

#### NO. 36-2 PROPERTY RIGHTS

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 36; Constitution 2-3-(a), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 3. Property Rights. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this constitution, any provisions of the bylaws of the National Collegiate Athletic Association or any official interpretation (commonly called 'O.I.'), membership in the Association shall never be conditioned upon the assignment to the Association,

or to any officer, agent, employee, committee or council of the Association, or to any other association, corporation, partnership or individual, of the title to, or the right to dispose of or restrict the disposition of the title to, either in whole or in part, any form of property right of a member institution, unless the member institution has specifically consented by casting an affirmative vote or by an expressed affirmation of the division (I-A, I-AA, II or III) in which it has membership."

Source: All eight members of the Big Eight Conference.

Action: Defeated.

#### NO. 37 NCAA PENALTY STRUCTURE

Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 7-(b), pages 166-168, by adding new subparagraph (4), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(4) Assessment of an amount not in excess of \$50,000 in any single case or proceeding;"

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To establish a system of financial penalties as an alternative disciplinary measure under the Association's enforcement procedures.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated.

#### NO. 38 POSTSEASON FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 2-(j) and (k), pages 56-58, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(j) During the period of August 1 to the conclusion of its football game on the *third* Saturday following the *third* Tuesday in November or 6 p.m. local time, whichever is earlier, a representative of a member institution, including its administrators, faculty, athletic staff members, conference officials, representatives of its athletic interests or student-athletes:

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) Between November 1 and the conclusion of its football game on the *third* Saturday following the *third* Tuesday in November or 6 p.m. local time, whichever is earlier, may contact a representative of a certified postseason football game to discuss the possibility of its team's participation in such game; and"

[Subparagraphs (3), (4) and (5) unchanged.]

"(k) During the period of August 1 to the conclusion of a member institution's football game on the *third* Saturday following the *third* Tuesday in November or 6 p.m. local time, whichever is earlier, any official or unofficial representative or agent of a certified postseason football game:

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) Between November 1 and the conclusion of a member institution's football game on the *third* Saturday following the *third* Tuesday in November or 6 p.m. local time, whichever is earlier, may discuss with a representative of a member institution the possibility of its team's participation in such game; and"

[Subparagraphs (3), (4) and (5) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Postseason Football Committee).

Intent: To permit bowl game managements to issue and member institutions to accept invitations to participate in those games beginning on the Saturday following the third Tuesday in November.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

#### NO. 39 COACHES' CONTRACTS

Recommended Policies: Amend Policy 7, page 159, by adding new Section 4, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 4. A contractual agreement between a coach and an institution should include the stipulation that the coach's employment may be terminated if the coach is found to be involved in violations of NCAA legislation."

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Intent: To encourage members to include in coaches' contracts a provision that a coach's employment may be terminated if the coach is involved in violations of NCAA legislation.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

#### NO. 40 FOOTBALL COACHING STAFF

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(a), page 95, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A and I-AA football only, divided vote]

"(a) Division I Football--One head coach, *eight* nine assistant coaches, and two part-time assistant coaches who are enrolled in a minimum of 50 percent of a normal load leading to a postgraduate degree."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1, pages 95-97, by deleting paragraph (g), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A and I-AA football only, divided vote]

"(g) If a member institution sponsors more than one intercollegiate football team, that member institution may employ or otherwise utilize two additional part-time coaches in the sport of football. Coaches employed or otherwise utilized for the purposes of this paragraph are prohibited from off-campus recruiting. Such additional teams must participate in four or more intercollegiate contests."



**Source:** University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Oklahoma State University; University of Pittsburgh; University of South Carolina; Texas Tech University; Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and seven other Division I member institutions.

**Intent:** To add one assistant coach and eliminate part-time coaches with the exception of two individuals who must be enrolled in a graduate degree program.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Defeated by Division I-A Football and by Division I-AA Football. Division I-A initially approved No. 40, 68-66. Subsequent motion to reconsider passed, 70-68. Division I-A then defeated No. 40, 64-71.

#### NO. 41 SCOUTING LIMITATIONS

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 7, Section 2, page 97, as follows:

[Division I only]

"Section 2. Limitations on Scouting. A Division I member institution shall not pay or permit the payment of expenses incurred by its athletic department staff members or representatives, including professional scouting services, to scout its opponents or individuals who represent its opponents in any sport except football and, basketball and soccer, where it shall be permissible for the institution to pay expenses of one person to scout each opponent on one occasion. It shall be permissible to pay the costs of exchanging films for scouting purposes in any sport."

**Source:** Adelphi University; Boston University; University of Connecticut; Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science; University of Portland; University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, and four other Division I member institutions.

**Intent:** To permit a Division I member institution to pay the expenses of one person to scout each opponent one time in the sport of soccer.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Defeated by Division I.

### Academic Requirements

#### NO. 42 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

**A. Bylaws:** Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j), page 73, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(j) The student-athlete must conform to the following eligibility provisions for all championships and in Divisions I and II for regular-season competition, practice and athletically related financial aid as indicated."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(6)-(i) and (ii), page 74, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(6) A student-athlete who has completed at least one academic year in residence or utilized one season of eligibility in a sport at the certifying institution shall be required to satisfy the following minimum academic progress requirements for continuing eligibility.

"(i) Eligibility for financial aid and practice during each academic year following after the student-athlete's initial year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in a sport shall be based upon the rules of the institution and the conference of which the institution is a member.

"(ii) Eligibility for regular-season competition subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in a sport shall be based upon: (1) satisfactory completion prior to each term in which a season of competition begins of an accumulative total of semester or quarter hours of academic credit required for acceptable toward a baccalaureate degree in a designated program of studies at the institution which is equivalent to the completion of an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms in academic years in which the student-athlete has been enrolled in a term or terms, or (2) satisfactory completion of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of acceptable degree credit since the beginning of the student-athlete's last season of competition."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Academic Testing and Requirements Committee).

**Intent:** To affirm that the satisfactory-progress rule applies to eligibility for regular-season competition at a Division II member institution; to require a student-athlete who has utilized a season of eligibility to meet the standards established by the legislation; to affirm that credit acceptable toward a baccalaureate degree may be utilized to satisfy the rule, and to require the student-athlete to average 12 hours of credit per term for each term in an academic year in which the student is enrolled in a term.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Approved by Divisions I and II (No. 42-B) and by Division II (No. 42-A).

#### NO. 43 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(6)-(ii), page 74, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(ii) Eligibility for regular-season competition subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence shall be based upon: (1) satisfactory completion prior to each term in which a season of competition begins of an accumulative total of semester or quarter hours of the academic credit required for a baccalaureate degree in a designated program of

studies at the institution which is equivalent to the completion of an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours in which the student-athlete has been enrolled, or (2) satisfactory completion of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of acceptable degree credit since the beginning of the student-athlete's last season of competition during the student-athlete's immediate past two semesters or three quarters of attendance: (1) with a minimum grade-point average of 1.600 (based upon a 4.000 scale) if the student-athlete has accumulated 60 or fewer semester or 90 or fewer quarter hours, or (2) with a minimum grade-point average of 1.800 if the student-athlete has accumulated more than 60 semester or 90 quarter hours; further, a student-athlete with an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 for all work completed at the certifying institution shall be eligible in any event provided that the student passed 24 semester hours the two preceding semesters or 36 quarter hours the three preceding quarters."

Source: University of Colorado; Iowa State University; University of Kansas; Kansas State University; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Oklahoma State University, and one other Division I member institution.

Intent: To require student-athletes to meet both quantitative and qualitative standards of academic progress in order to maintain eligibility to participate in intercollegiate athletic competition.

Effective Date: August 1, 1982 (to establish eligibility for 1983-84 academic year).

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

#### NO. 44 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(6), pages 74-75, by adding new subparagraph (iii), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(iii) A student-athlete who is absent from the institution for one or more consecutive academic term(s) subsequent to the initial year in residence on one occasion may remain eligible for competition under the provisions of subparagraph (ii); however, if a student-athlete for a second time has not attended the institution for a regular academic term after a season of competition, the student must remain enrolled as a full-time student for two consecutive semesters or three consecutive quarters prior to again becoming eligible for competition."

Source: All nine members of the Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To require a student-athlete who for a second time fails to attend a regular term at the institution after an initial year in residence to meet a residence requirement before again becoming eligible.

Effective Date: August 1, 1982.

Action: Withdrawn.

#### Television

[Note: Proposal Nos. 45 and 46 provide for review and approval of the Association's football television procedures to date. Proposal No. 47, if adopted, would establish new football television procedures for the future, superseding the interpretation set forth in No. 45. If No. 47-A is not adopted, Bylaw 11-3-(aa), including O.I. 1101 (if approved in No. 45), will be deleted effective December 31, 1985.]

#### NO. 45 FOOTBALL TELEVISION

Bylaws: Add new O.I. 1101, following Bylaw 11-3-(aa), page 123, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"O.I. 1101. The Association shall control all forms of televising of the intercollegiate football games of member institutions during the traditional football season as defined in O.I. 307. The terms or principles of the control shall be set forth in a television plan or program which periodically shall be prepared by the Football Television Committee, approved by the NCAA Council for submission to the membership by a mail referendum and approved by at least two-thirds of the members voting in such referendum. Any commitment by a member institution with respect to the televising or cablecasting of its football games in future seasons necessarily would be subject to the terms of the NCAA Football Television Plan applicable to such season."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To provide for review and approval of the NCAA Council's April 17, 1981, interpretation regarding the Association's control of all forms of televising of the intercollegiate football games of member institutions during the traditional fall season and to affirm the Football Television Committee's authority to prepare television plans for approval by the Council and the membership, using the same procedure followed by the membership on a regular basis for the past 30 years.

Action: Approved.

#### NO. 46 RESOLUTION: FOOTBALL TELEVISION

[All divisions, common vote]

"Be It Resolved, that in order to eliminate any question as to the validity and binding effect of actions taken with respect to the football television program for 1982-1985, the actions taken by the membership, Council, Football Television Committee and officers of the Association during 1981 and to date in the formulation and implementation of the Association's football television program for 1982-1985 consistent with the policies stated in O.I. 1101 are hereby approved and ratified."

Source: NCAA Council.  
Action: Approved.

## NO. 47 FOOTBALL TELEVISION

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3 by adding new Section 11, page 25, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 11. Principle Governing Football Television. The telecasting, cablecasting or otherwise televising of intercollegiate football games of member institutions shall be controlled by bylaws enacted by the Association."

B. Bylaws: If No. 47-A is adopted, add a new Bylaw 8, Football Television, following page 97, renumbering subsequent bylaw articles, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

### ARTICLE EIGHT

#### FOOTBALL TELEVISION

"Section 1. Control of Football Television. The Association shall control all forms of the telecasting, cablecasting or otherwise televising of the intercollegiate football games of member institutions during the traditional fall season as defined in Bylaw 3-2 in accordance with the following provisions.

"Section 2. Football Television Principles. The terms of the Association's control shall be set forth in television principles for each division (i.e., Divisions I, II and III) as periodically prepared by the Football Television Committee and approved by majority vote of those voting in the respective divisions. [Note: The provisions of Bylaw 10-1(g) do not apply to voting by Division I under this bylaw article.]

"(a) Only members that sponsor varsity intercollegiate football shall be permitted to vote on adoption of NCAA football television principles and on amendments to this bylaw article, provided, however, that all such principles shall be subject to the rescission provisions set forth in Bylaw 12. An institution which sponsors football as a varsity intercollegiate sport in a division other than its membership division shall vote in the division in which its football program is classified.

"(b) Each division shall determine its own procedure for the approval of the football television principles and the formulation and adoption of the provisions of a supporting plan. The members of a division may approve such principles by mail referendum of those members.

"(c) Any commitment by a member institution with respect to telecasting or cablecasting or otherwise televising its football games in a future season or seasons shall be subject to the terms of the NCAA football television princi-

ples and supporting plan provisions applicable to such season(s) for that institution's football division."

C. Bylaws: If No. 47-A is adopted, amend Article 11, Section 3-(aa), page 123, by deleting the present language and substituting the following:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(aa) The Football Television Committee shall consist of 18 members and shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) Nine members representing Division I-A Football, with one member representing Districts 1 and 2; two members representing District 3; one member each representing Districts 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, and one member selected at large;

"(2) Two women members, at least one of whom shall represent Division I-A Football;

"(3) Four members representing Division I-AA Football, with one member representing each Division I-AA Football region, and

"(4) Three members representing Divisions II and III, with each of those divisions being represented by at least one member.

"(5) The members representing Divisions I-AA, II and III shall include, as to each division, at least one current or former member of that division's football committee.

"(6) One of the Division I-A Football members shall be elected chair.

"(7) The committee shall act as one body for the formulation of football television principles which may be applicable to all divisions and for the adoption and administration of the Association's football television principles and plan, but representatives from the respective divisions (Division I and combined Divisions II-III) shall be responsible for the formulation of the football television principles and plan provisions which may be applicable solely to their respective divisions."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish in the constitution that the bylaws of the Association shall provide for NCAA controls over all forms of football television and cablecasting; to specify in the bylaws that each of the three divisions may act separately on football television principles, with only football-playing members of each division to vote on such principles, and to restructure the Football Television Committee. [Note: If No. 47-A is not adopted, Bylaw 11-(3)-(aa), including O.L. 1101 (if approved in No. 45), will be deleted effective December 31, 1985.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved, Part A approved by Convention as a whole; Parts B and C by all divisions.

## NO. 47-1 FOOTBALL TELEVISION

**A. Constitution:** Amend Proposal No. 47-A; Constitution 3-11, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 11. Principle Governing Football Television. The telecasting, and cablecasting or otherwise televising, excluding pay and subscription television, of intercollegiate football games of member institutions shall be controlled by bylaws enacted by the Association."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal 47-B; Bylaws 8-1 and 8-2-(c), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 1. Control of Football Television. The Association shall control all forms of the telecasting, and cablecasting or otherwise televising of the intercollegiate football games of member institutions during the traditional fall season as defined in Bylaw 3-2 in accordance with the following provisions.

[Section 2-(a) and (b) unchanged.]

"(c) Any commitment by a member institution with respect to telecasting or and cablecasting or otherwise televising its football games in a future season or seasons shall be subject to the terms of the NCAA football television principles and supporting plan provisions applicable to such season(s) for that institution's football division."

**Source:** University of Pittsburgh.

**Action:** Defeated. Part A defeated by Convention as a whole; Part B by all divisions.

## NO. 47-2 RESOLUTION: FOOTBALL TELEVISION

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, voting on future television principles as set forth in Proposal No. 47-B, Section 2, will not occur until the next NCAA Football Television Plan(s) are formulated in 1985; and

"Whereas, the NCAA Council believes that its original proposal can be improved to better reflect the intent of this television restructuring for Division I;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Council shall submit legislation at the 1983 NCAA Convention to specify that the majority approval of Division I football television principles required by No. 47-B, Section 2, shall require a majority vote of Division I-A football-playing members present and voting, as well as a majority of football-playing members of Division I-A and Division I-AA present and voting together."

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Action:** Approved.

## NO. 48 FOOTBALL TELEVISION COMMITTEE

Amend Proposal No. 47-C, Bylaw 11-3-(aa), by deleting subpara-

graphs (1) and (3) and substituting the following, renumbering subsequent paragraphs:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) Thirteen representatives of Divisions I-A and I-AA Football, with each of the subdivisions being represented proportionately to the number of institutions in each of the subdivisions, with at least three representatives from each of the following geographic regions: (i) Districts 1 and 2, (ii) District 3, (iii) Districts 4 and 5 and (iv) Districts 6, 7 and 8;"

**Source:** All nine members of the Southern Conference.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

## NO. 49 NCAA PENALTY STRUCTURE

**Enforcement Procedure:** Amend Section 7-(b)-(6), page 167, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(6) Ineligibility for any television programs subject to the Association's control or administration, or any other television programs involving live coverage of the institution's intercollegiate athletic team or teams in the sport or sports in which the violations occurred;"

**Source:** NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions, Recruiting Committee).

**Intent:** To permit the Committee on Infractions or Council to impose television sanctions in sports in which live television programming is not subject to the Association's control or administration.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Approved.

## Amateurism

### NO. 50 STUDENT-ATHLETE EMPLOYMENT

**Constitution:** Amend Article 3, Section 1-(f)-(1) and (2), page 12, and add new subparagraph (3), renumbering subsequent subparagraph, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) A student-athlete may serve as a coach or an instructor for compensation in a physical education class outside of the student-athlete's institution in which the student-athlete teaches sports techniques or skills or both, but a student-athlete shall not be so employed to coach or teach in his or her sport if the employment is arranged by the student-athlete's institution or a representative of its athletic interests. A student-athlete shall not be employed in or



by the student-athlete's institution to teach physical education classes or coach any sport.

"(2) A student-athlete may not be employed or receive compensation for teaching or coaching sports skills or techniques in the student-athlete's sport unless such instruction is a part of the overall terms of employment (i.e., teaching and coaching shall not demand more than half of the student-athlete's employed time) and not on a fee-for-lesson basis.

"(3) A student-athlete may be employed by his or her institution to work in the institution's summer camp unless otherwise restricted by the provisions of the bylaws and interpretations relating to playing and practice seasons and summer camps."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Special Committee on Legislative Review).

**Intent:** To permit a student-athlete to coach or teach in the student-athlete's sport, provided that the employment is not by the institution or arranged by the institution or a representative of its athletic interests.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Approved.

#### NO. 51 COMPLIMENTARY TICKETS

**Constitution:** Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(3), page 13, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(3) Awarding complimentary tickets in excess of four per student-athlete per contest and awarding complimentary tickets to student-athletes in sports other than those in which the student-athlete is a participant, except as may be provided in the bylaws. It is not permissible for a student-athlete to sell the complimentary tickets awarded to the student-athlete, whether at below or above face value, or to exchange them for any item of value, provided that the tickets are not repurchased by the student-athlete's institution."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

**Intent:** To permit a student-athlete to sell complimentary tickets at face value as long as they are not sold to the student-athlete's institution.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Defeated.

#### NO. 52 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES

**Constitution:** Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h), page 14, by adding new subparagraph (6), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(6) Actual and necessary travel expenses for participation in an annual all-star contest sponsored by an affiliated member provided the student-athlete has achieved senior

status and has exhausted intercollegiate athletic eligibility in that sport."

**Source:** Bucknell University, Colorado School of Mines, Hobart College, Hofstra University, Washington and Lee University, Western Maryland College and three other Division III member institutions.

**Intent:** To permit a member institution to pay actual and necessary travel expenses for a student-athlete who has exhausted eligibility in a sport to participate in an all-star contest sponsored by an affiliated member.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Defeated.

#### NO. 53 AWARDS--SPECIAL EVENTS

**Constitution:** Amend Article 3, Section 1-(i)-(1)-(ii), pages 14-15, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(ii) Awards for special events such as postseason football games, NCAA meets and tournaments and featured individual competition may be presented only by the management of such an event and an institution which has had or will have a team participate in such event. All awards must be properly personalized and conform to the standards enumerated in paragraph (i) above. Multiple awards are permissible for a special event, but the value of any and all awards received by any one competitor in such special event may not exceed \$200 \$300."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Postseason Football Committee).

**Intent:** To increase the dollar limitation on the specified type of awards from \$200 to \$300.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Approved.

#### Eligibility

##### NO. 54 FIVE-YEAR RULE

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 4, Section 1, page 69, by deleting paragraphs (a) and (b) and adding new paragraph (a), relettering subsequent paragraph, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions II and III, divided vote]

"(a) The student-athlete must complete his or her seasons of participation during the first 10 semesters or 15 quarters in which the student is enrolled in a collegiate institution in at least a minimum full-time program of studies as determined by the regulations of that institution. For an institution that determines registration other than

on a traditional semester or quarter basis, the NCAA Eligibility Committee shall determine an equivalent enrollment period."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee, Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To replace the five-calendar-year limitation on eligibility with a five-year residency limitation for student-athletes in Divisions II and III.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions II and III.

#### NO. 55 ELIGIBILITY - FRESHMEN

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d), page 70 as follows:

[Division I only]

"(d) The student-athlete must not have engaged previously in three seasons of intercollegiate competition after the freshman year in Division I or in more than four seasons of intercollegiate competition in Divisions II and III."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d)-(4), page 72, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(4) Freshmen are eligible for varsity competition in all sports. Participation by a freshman on the intercollegiate team of a junior college shall be counted as one of the four permissible seasons of intercollegiate competition."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(1), page 73, and add new subparagraphs (2) and (3), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(1) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated as a 2,000 qualifier in a Division I institution shall be eligible for financial aid, regular-season competition and practice based only upon institutional and conference regulations.

"(2) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated with an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.750 is eligible for varsity competition in all sports.

"(3) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated with an accumulative grade-point average less than 2.750 shall not be eligible for varsity competition during the first academic year in residence."

Source: University of Arizona; Arizona State University; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Oregon; Oregon State University, and three other Division I member institutions.

Intent: To require an entering freshman to have graduated from high school with an accumulative grade-point average of 2.750 or higher

in order to be eligible for varsity competition as a freshman in Divisions I and II, but to permit four years of varsity competition for the student-athlete who does not compete as a freshman.

Effective Date: August 1, 1983.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II (Parts B and C). Part A moot due to adoption of No. 56, which was considered prior to No. 55 on a successful motion to change the order.

#### NO. 55-1 ELIGIBILITY - FRESHMEN

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 55-C; Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(2) and (3), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(2) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated with an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.750 2.500 is eligible for varsity competition in all sports.

"(3) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated with an accumulative grade-point average less than 2.750 2.500 shall not be eligible for varsity competition during the first academic year in residence."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

#### NO. 56 SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d), page 70, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(d) The student-athlete must not have engaged previously in three seasons of intercollegiate competition after the freshman year in Division I or in more than four seasons of intercollegiate competition in Divisions II and III."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee, Division I Steering Committee, Special Committee on Legislative Review).

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to participate in four seasons of competition in Division I and remain eligible for NCAA championship competition, regardless of whether the student-athlete participates as a freshman.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

#### NO. 57 ELIGIBILITY - 2,000 RULE

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j), page 73, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(j) The student-athlete must conform to the following eligibility provisions for all championships and in Division I for regular-season competition, practice and athletically related financial aid as indicated.

[Note: A 2,000 2,200 qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is

a high school graduate and at the time of graduation from high school presented an accumulative six, seven or eight semesters' minimum grade-point average of 2.000 2.200 (based on a maximum of 4.000) or, subsequent to graduation from high school, presented a minimum grade-point average of 2.000 2.200 after at least one academic year of attendance at and graduation from a preparatory school, as certified on the high school or preparatory school transcript or by official correspondence.]"

**Source:** University of Colorado; Duke University; University of Kansas; University of Missouri, Columbia; Oklahoma State University; Vanderbilt University, and one other Division I member institution.

**Intent:** To increase the 2.000 requirement for initial eligibility at a Division I member institution to 2.200. [Note: Necessary editorial changes will be made to amend references to the 2.000 rule as it relates to Division I in other paragraphs, including Bylaw 5-6-(b)-(1).]

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Defeated by Division I, 91-180, as amended by No. 57-1.

#### **NO. 57-1 ELIGIBILITY--2.000 RULE**

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 57; Bylaw 5-1-(j), as follows:

[Division I only]

**"Effective Date:** August 1, 1982 1983."

**Source:** Southern Methodist University.

**Action:** Approved by Division I.

#### **NO. 58 ELIGIBILITY--2.000 RULE**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j), page 73, as follows:

[Division I only]

**"(j)** The student-athlete must conform to the following eligibility provisions for all championships and in Division I for regular-season competition, practice and athletically related financial aid as indicated.

**"[Note:** A 2.000 qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and at the time of graduation from high school presented an accumulative six, seven or eight semesters' minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) or, subsequent to graduation from high school, presented a minimum grade-point average of 2.000 after at least one academic year of attendance at and graduation from a preparatory school, as certified on the high school or preparatory school transcript or by official correspondence.]"

**Source:** All 10 members of the Mid-American Athletic Conference.

**Intent:** To eliminate the opportunity to become a 2.000 qualifier for initial eligibility at a Division I member institution on the basis of

one year of attendance at a preparatory school subsequent to graduation from high school.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Approved by Division I.

#### **NO. 59 HARSHIP**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d)-(2)-(i), page 71, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

**"(i)** It occurs in one of the four seasons of intercollegiate competition at any four-year collegiate institution for members of Division I, or at any two-year or four-year collegiate institution for members of Division II or III, or during the summer preceding initial enrollment in a member institution."

**Source:** All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

**Intent:** To permit a student-athlete who sustained an incapacitating injury or illness during the summer preceding initial enrollment in a member institution, and who meets the other requirements of Bylaw 5-1-(d)-(2), to be considered for a hardship ruling at an NCAA member institution.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

#### **NO. 60 HARSHIP--JUNIOR COLLEGE**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d)-(2)-(i), page 71, as follows:

[Division I only]

**"(i)** It occurs in one of the four seasons of intercollegiate competition at any four-year collegiate institution for members of Division I, or at any two-year or four-year collegiate institution for members of Division II or III."

**Source:** All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

**Intent:** To permit a student-athlete who sustained an incapacitating injury or illness while in junior college, and who meets the other requirements of Bylaw 5-1-(d)-(2), to be considered for a hardship ruling at a Division I NCAA member institution.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Defeated by Division I. Originally withdrawn but voted upon after objection by a delegate to the withdrawal.

#### **NO. 61 TRANSFER RULE--WAIVER**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 5, Section 3, pages 81-82, by adding new paragraph (g), as follows;

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

**"(g)** The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may waive (upon recommendation

of the Committee on Infractions) the residence requirement set forth in Bylaw 5-1 for a student-athlete who transfers to a member institution to continue the student-athlete's opportunity for full participation in a particular sport because the student-athlete's original institution was placed on probation by the NCAA with sanctions that would preclude the institution's team in that sport from participating in postseason competition during all of the remaining seasons of the student-athlete's eligibility."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

**Intent:** To permit a waiver of the transfer rule for a student-athlete enrolled in a member institution that is placed on probation with sanctions that would preclude the student-athlete's team from participation in postseason competition during the remainder of the student-athlete's eligibility.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Approved by all divisions.

#### **NO. 62 TRANSFER RULE—NONRECRUITED STUDENT-ATHLETE**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m), pages 79-81, by adding new subparagraph (10), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(10) If the student transfers to the certifying institution and the following conditions are met:

"(i) The student-athlete was not recruited per O.I. 100,

"(ii) No athletically related financial assistance has been received by the student-athlete and

"(iii) The student-athlete has neither practiced nor competed in intercollegiate athletics prior to transfer."

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To permit a waiver of the transfer residence requirement for a transferring student-athlete who was not recruited, has received no athletically related financial aid and has not practiced or competed in intercollegiate athletics.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Approved by all divisions.

#### **NO. 63 TRANSFER RULE—DISCONTINUED SPORT**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m)-(8), page 80, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(8) In a particular sport if the Eligibility Committee concludes that the student changed institutions in order to continue participation in a sport because the student's original

four-year collegiate institution dropped the sport (in which the student has practiced or competed at that institution in intercollegiate competition) from its intercollegiate program or never sponsored the sport on the intercollegiate level while the student was in attendance at that institution, provided the student had never attended any other collegiate institution which offered intercollegiate competition in that particular sport."

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To permit a waiver of the transfer residence requirement for a student-athlete transferring from an institution that dropped from its intercollegiate athletic program a sport in which the student-athlete participated.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Approved by all divisions.

#### **NO. 64 TRANSFER—JUNIOR COLLEGE**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 5, Section 1-(k)-(1)-(i), page 77, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(i) Has completed a minimum of 24 semester hours or a minimum of 36 quarter hours at the junior college following transfer from the four-year college and also has graduated from the junior college, and one calendar year has elapsed since the transfer from the first four-year college, or"

**Source:** Albany, State University of New York; Binghamton, State University of New York; Brockport State University College; Buffalo State University College; Cortland State University College; Fredonia State University College, and 13 other Division III member institutions.

**Intent:** To permit a junior college transfer who has completed the specified minimum number of hours to be eligible at a Division III member institution one calendar year after transferring from a previous four-year institution without graduating from the junior college.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Approved by Division III.

#### **NO. 65 TRANSFER—JUNIOR COLLEGE**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 5, Section 1-(n), page 81, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(n) A transfer student from a junior college is not subject to the residence requirement for NCAA championships under the following conditions:

"(1) If the NCAA Eligibility Committee concludes that the student changed institutions in order to continue participation in a sport because the student's original junior college dropped the sport from its intercollegiate program or never



sponsored the sport on the intercollegiate level while the student was in attendance at that institution; provided the student never attended any other collegiate institution which offered intercollegiate competition in that particular sport and provided the student earned at least a minimum 2.000 grade-point average at the junior college.

"(2) In a particular sport if the student has not competed in that sport at the previous institution or has not competed in that sport for a period of one year immediately prior to the date on which the student begins participation (practice or competition) in that sport at the certifying institution and the student has entered the certifying institution prior to the start of the regular-season competition in that sport and provided the student earned at least a minimum 2.000 grade-point average at the junior college."

**Source:** All 12 members of the State University of New York Athletic Conference and all eight members of the New Jersey State College Athletic Conference.

**Intent:** To provide an opportunity for immediate NCAA championship eligibility at a Division III member institution for a junior college transfer who has not competed in the sport at all or has not competed for a period of one year at the junior college.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Approved by Division III.

#### NO. 66 TRANSFER RULE—DIVISION III

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m)-(11), pages 80-81, by deleting subparagraph (ii), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(ii) The student previously has not been granted a waiver of the residence requirement."

**Source:** Buffalo, State University of New York; Elmira College; Fitchburg State College; Franklin and Marshall College; Trinity College; Wesleyan University, and one other Division III member institution.

**Intent:** To permit a student-athlete to transfer to a Division III member institution and be immediately eligible under the provisions of Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(11) on more than one occasion.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Defeated by Division III, 74-89.

#### NO. 67 TRANSFER RULE—DIVISION III

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m)-(11)-(ii) and (iv), pages 80-81, as follows:

A-42

[Division III only]

"(ii) The student previously has not been granted a waiver of the residence requirement transferred to a Division III member institution and been immediately eligible under the provisions of Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(11);

"(iv) The student has entered the certifying institution prior to the start of the regular-season competition in the sport in which the waiver is desired, or the student has not competed or practiced during the current academic year at the previous institution in that sport."

**Source:** Buffalo, State University of New York; Elmira College; Fitchburg State College; Franklin and Marshall College; Trinity College; Wesleyan University, and one other Division III member institution.

**Intent:** To clarify that Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(11) permits a student who meets its requirements to be immediately eligible, rather than requiring a waiver.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

#### Financial Aid

#### NO. 68 FINANCIAL AID—DIVISION II

**A. Bylaws:** Amend Article 10, Section 2, pages 110-111, by adding new paragraph (a), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(a) An institution desiring to be a member of Division II shall not award to any student-athlete financial aid which exceeds tuition and fees and required course-related books or the student-athlete's financial need, as determined by a need analysis system which conforms to the national standard formulated by the U.S. Department of Education, whichever amount is greater. The forms distributed by the Department of Education or services approved by it shall be utilized in determining financial need and shall be submitted to the appropriate service by individuals seeking to receive assistance from a Division II member institution while participating in intercollegiate athletics.

"(1) A student-athlete at a Division II member institution who receives institutional financial assistance shall not be eligible for intercollegiate athletic competition if the student's institutional financial assistance when combined with earnings from employment during semester or term time (which is an all-inclusive period from the opening to the closing day of classes of the semester, quarter, term or summer session, except for the vacation periods properly listed on the institution's

A-43

official calendar) exceeds financial need as determined in accordance with this paragraph.

"(2) If, after the initial determination of financial need, the director of financial aid at a member institution determines that extraordinary circumstances exist in regard to a particular student-athlete, the institution may appeal to the NCAA Financial Aid Committee for a recalculation of the maximum amount of financial aid which the student-athlete may receive.

"(3) An enrolled or prospective student-athlete must file the approved form annually.

"(4) A Division II member institution need not apply the provisions of this paragraph to a student-athlete who was regularly enrolled in an NCAA member institution prior to August 1, 1982."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Article 11, Section 3, page 121, by adding new paragraph (1), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) The Financial Aid Committee shall consist of five members from Division II. Two of the positions shall be allocated for men, two allocated for women and one unallocated. The committee shall have final authority in determining a recalculation of the maximum amount of financial aid which a Division II student-athlete can receive in accordance with Bylaw 10-2(a)."

**Source:** Augustana College (South Dakota), Delta State University, Mansfield State College, Northern Kentucky University, University of South Dakota, South Dakota State University and one other Division II member institution.

**Intent:** To specify that student-athletes at Division II member institutions shall be awarded financial aid only on the basis of need, except for tuition and fees and required course-related books, and to establish a Financial Aid Committee.

**Effective Date:** September 1, 1982.

**Action:** Defeated by Division II. Part B moot due to defeat of Part A. Motion to postpone indefinitely failed to receive a second.

#### NO. 69 FINANCIAL AID DEFINITION

**Constitution:** Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(1), page 12, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) The award of financial aid to a student-athlete which exceeds commonly accepted educational expenses (i.e., tuition and fees, room and board, **\$50 per month for incidental expenses** and required course-related books), other than legitimate loans, based upon a regular repayment schedule, available to all students and administered on the same basis for all students."

**Source:** Iowa State University; University of Kansas; Kansas State

University; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Oklahoma State University, and one other Division I member institution.

**Intent:** To increase the maximum grant-in-aid allowance by adding \$50 per month for incidental expenses.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Defeated.

#### NO. 70 FINANCIAL AID DEFINITION

**Constitution:** Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(1), page 12, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) The award of financial aid to a student-athlete which exceeds commonly accepted educational expenses (i.e., tuition and fees, room and board, **\$25 per month for incidental expenses** and required course-related books), other than legitimate loans, based upon a regular repayment schedule, available to all students and administered on the same basis for all students."

**Source:** Iowa State University; University of Kansas; Kansas State University; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Oklahoma State University, and one other Division I member institution.

**Intent:** To increase the maximum grant-in-aid allowance by adding \$25 per month for incidental expenses.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Defeated.

#### NO. 71 FINANCIAL AID—SUMMER SCHOOL

**Constitution:** Amend Article 3, Section 4-(b)-(1), page 18, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) It is permissible to award financial financial aid may not be provided to a student while attending a summer school or summer term unless the student has been in residence a minimum of one term during the regular academic year, and then such financial aid may be utilized only to attend the awarding institution's summer term or summer school, under the following conditions:

"(i) Prior to the student's initial fall term, provided the student has been unconditionally admitted to that institution prior to enrolling in the summer session; or

"(ii) The student has been in residence a minimum of one term during the regular academic year.

"(iii) Such financial aid may be utilized only to attend the awarding institution's summer school or summer term.

"(iv) An enrolled student-athlete who is receiving financial assistance based upon athletic ability during the summertime prior to the student's freshman year

shall be subject to the Bylaw 5-1 transfer rules for an enrolled student-athlete."

**Source:** Florida State University; University of Maryland, College Park; University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; University of Pittsburgh; University of Virginia, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

**Intent:** To permit the award of countable financial aid to an eligible student-athlete to attend the summer session(s) at the awarding institution prior to the student's initial fall term at that institution, provided the student has been unconditionally accepted for admission prior to enrollment in the summer session(s). [Note: Bylaw 1-9(a) and appropriate interpretations would be revised editorially to permit such financial assistance.]

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Defeated.

#### NO. 72 FINANCIAL AID--SUMMER SCHOOL

**Constitution:** Amend Article 3, Section 4-(b)-(1), page 18, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) Financial aid may not be provided a student while attending a summer school or summer term unless the student has been in residence a minimum of one term during the regular academic year, and then or the student is attending a summer orientation program for which participation (by both athletes and nonathletes) is required and financial aid is administered on the same basis for all participants in the program. such Such financial aid may be utilized only to attend the awarding institution's summer term or summer school."

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To permit an incoming student-athlete to receive financial aid during the summertime prior to the student's freshman year under the specified circumstances.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Approved.

#### NO. 73 FINANCIAL AID--PELL GRANTS

**Constitution:** Amend Article 3, Section 4-(d)-(2)-(iv), page 20, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(iv) Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOG) Pell Grants, provided the overall grant total, combining financial aid based on athletic ability and other institutionally administered financial aid and the BEOG Pell Grant, does not exceed the value of tuition, fees, room and board and required course-related books, plus \$900 or the amount permitted for miscellaneous expenses under the cost of education formula defined by the U.S. Department of Education in the administration of the BEOG program Pell Grant received by the student-

athlete, whichever is less."

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To conform the name of the grant program to recent changes in the law and to permit a student-athlete who receives a Pell Grant as well as institutionally administered financial assistance to receive a maximum combined total amount which does not exceed the value of tuition, fees, room and board and required course-related books, plus the lesser of \$900 or the miscellaneous expense portion of the student-athlete's Pell Grant.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Approved as amended by No. 73-1.

#### NO. 73--1 FINANCIAL AID--PELL GRANTS

**Constitution:** Amend Proposal No. 73; Constitution 3-4-(d)-(2)-(iv), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(iv) Pell Grants, provided the overall grant total, combining financial aid based on athletic ability and other institutionally administered financial aid and the Pell Grant, does not exceed the value of tuition, fees, room and board and required course-related books, plus \$900 or the amount permitted for miscellaneous expenses under the cost of education formula defined by the U.S. Department of Education in the administration of the Pell Grant program received by the student-athlete, whichever is less."

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Action:** Approved.

#### NO. 74 FINANCIAL AID--INCOME

**Constitution:** Amend Article 3, Section 4-(d)-(1)-(i), page 20, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(i) An institution shall count income from any employment during semester or term time, regardless of whether the student-athlete's job is one obtained following completion of eligibility in the student-athlete's senior year; gifts given to a student-athlete following completion of eligibility in appreciation or recognition of the student-athlete's athletic accomplishments, and any bonus or salary from a professional sports organization, or any other income from participation in an athletic event (except that an institution shall not count a maximum of \$2,000 received by a student-athlete from participation in a postseason football or basketball all-star game subsequent to completion of the student's seasons of eligibility in that sport), no matter when received or contracted for."

**Source:** University of Colorado; University of Kansas; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma, and Oklahoma State University.

**Intent:** To permit student-athletes in the sport of football or basketball who have completed their seasons of intercollegiate competition in their sport to participate in and receive income from postseason athletic events.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Defeated.

## NO. 75 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I WOMEN

**A. Bylaws:** Amend Article 6, Section 5-(a), page 91, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(a) Division I—In each sport, except football, men's and women's basketball, women's golf, women's gymnastics, women's tennis and women's volleyball, there shall be a limit on the value of the financial aid awards in effect at any one time, including awards made to freshmen, transfer students (from two-year and four-year institutions) and upperclassmen; further, the total number (based on equivalencies) of financial aid awards in effect at any one time for all men's sports, except football and basketball, shall not exceed the maximum limit of 70."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Article 6, Section 5-(b), page 91, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(b) Division I—Following are the maximum awards which may be in effect at any one time:

### "(1) For men's sports:

Total for all sports except football and basketball: 70

Baseball	13	Skating	7
Cross Country/Track	14	Soccer	11
Fencing	5	Swimming	11
Golf	5	Tennis	5
Gymnastics	7	Volleyball	5
Ice Hockey	20	Water Polo	5
Lacrosse	14	Wrestling	11
Rifle	4		

### "(2) For women's sports:

Cross Country/Track	16	Lacrosse	11
Fencing	5	Softball	11
Field Hockey	11	Swimming	14"

**C. Bylaws:** Amend Article 6, Section 5-(e), page 92, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(e) Division I Men's and Women's Basketball—There shall be an annual limit of 15 for men and 15 for women on the total number of financial aid awards which may be in effect the same year."

**D. Bylaws:** Amend Article 6, Section 5, pages 90-93, by adding new paragraph (f), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(f) Division I Women's Golf, Women's Gymnastics, Women's Tennis and Women's Volleyball—Following are the annual limits on the total number of financial aid awards which may be in effect in the same year in each sport:

Golf	6	Tennis	8
Gymnastics	10	Volleyball	12"

**Source:** NCAA Council (Special Committee on Legislative Review).

**Intent:** To establish specific financial aid limitations for women's sports in Division I, based on value (equivalencies) in all sports except basketball, golf, gymnastics, tennis and volleyball, which are based on number (head count). [Note: Bylaws 6-5-(h) and (i) would be revised editorially to reflect these provisions.]

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Approved by Division I as amended by No. 75-1.

## NO. 75-1 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I WOMEN

**A. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 75-A; Bylaw 6-5-(a), as follows:

[Division I only]

"(a) Division I—In each sport, except football, men's and women's basketball, women's golf, women's gymnastics, women's tennis and women's volleyball, there shall be a limit on the value of the financial aid awards in effect at any one time, including awards made to freshmen, transfer students (from two-year and four-year institutions) and upperclassmen; further, the total number (based on equivalencies) of financial aid awards in effect at any one time for all men's sports, except football and basketball, shall not exceed the maximum limit of 70."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 75-B; Bylaw 6-5-(b)-(2), as follows:

[Division I only]

### "(2) For women's sports:

Cross Country/Track	16	Lacrosse	11
Fencing	5	Softball	11
Field Hockey	11	Swimming	14"
Golf	6		

**C. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 75-D; Bylaw 6-5-(f), as follows:

[Division I only]

"(f) Division I Women's Golf, Women's Gymnastics, Women's Tennis and Women's Volleyball—Following are the annual limits on the total number of financial aid awards which may be in effect in the same year in each sport:

Golf	6	Tennis	8
Gymnastics	10	Volleyball	12"

**Source:** NCAA Council (Women's Golf Committee).

**Action:** Approved by Division I.



## NO. 76 MAXIMUM AWARDS--DIVISION I WOMEN'S SOFTBALL

Amend Proposal No. 75-B, Bylaw 6-5-(b)-(2), as follows:

[Division I only]

"Softball

11 13"

Source: University of California, Los Angeles.

Action: Withdrawn.

## NO. 77 MAXIMUM AWARDS--DIVISION II WOMEN

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(f), page 92, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(f) Division II--In each sport, there shall be a limit on the value of the financial aid awards in effect at any one time, including awards made to freshmen, transfer students (from two-year and four-year institutions) and upperclassmen; further, the total number (based on equivalencies) of financial aid awards in effect at any one time for all men's sports, excluding football and basketball, shall not exceed the maximum limit of 60."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(g), page 92, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(g) Division II--Following are the maximum awards which may be in effect at any one time: [Note: A Division II member institution electing to exceed the limitations of this paragraph in a sport or sports is governed by the provisions of Bylaw 5-6-(f).]

### "(1) For men's sports:

Total for all sports except football and basketball: 60	
Baseball	10
Basketball	12
Cross Country/Track	14
Fencing	5
Football	45
Golf	4
Gymnastics	6
Ice Hockey	15
Lacrosse	12
Rifle	4
Skiing	7
Soccer	10
Swimming	9
Tennis	5
Volleyball	5
Water Polo	5
Wrestling	10

### "(2) For women's sports:

Basketball	11
Cross Country/Track	12
Fencing	14
Field Hockey	5
Golf	7
Gymnastics	6
Lacrosse	8
Softball	9
Swimming	6
Tennis	6
Volleyball	8"

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Legislative Review).

Intent: To establish specific financial aid limitations for women's sports in Division II, based on value (equivalencies) in all sports.

A-50

Effective Date: August 1, 1982.

Action: Approved by Division II.

## NO. 78 FINANCIAL AID LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(h), pages 92-93, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(h) With respect to sports other than basketball in Division I, football in Division I-A and the total maximum awards limitation in football in Division I-AA, and with respect to all sports in Division II, a member institution may administer such awards to any number of recipients on the basis of value (equivalency) as long as the total dollar amount of **athletically related aid** expended does not exceed the value of "commonly accepted educational expenses" tuition and fees at that institution multiplied by the number of maximum awards permitted for the particular sport in its division. The following computational method shall be utilized in administering this procedure:

"(1) The institution shall count the actual amount of **athletically related** money a student-athlete is awarded or receives for room, board, tuition and fees, as well as books (which may not exceed \$200 per academic year)."

[Subparagraphs (2) and (3) unchanged]

Source: University of Kansas, University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University, Texas Christian University, University of Virginia, Wake Forest University and two other Division I member institutions.

Intent: To specify that athletically related financial aid awarded to student-athletes in sports other than basketball and football at Division I member institutions and all sports at Division II member institutions shall be limited to tuition and mandatory fees, without restricting the ability of student-athletes to receive other institutional financial aid, awarded without regard to their athletic ability. [Note: Current Case No. 51 would be deleted.]

Effective Date: August 1, 1982, for those student-athletes first entering member institutions after that date, and upon renewal of financial aid subsequent to the opening term (semester or quarter) of the 1982-83 academic year, for those student-athletes enrolled in an NCAA member institution prior to that date.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II as amended by No. 78-1.

## NO. 78-1 FINANCIAL AID LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 78; Bylaw 6-5-(h), as follows:

[Division I only]

"(h) With respect to sports other than basketball in Division I, football in Division I-A and the total maximum awards limitation in football in Division I-AA, and with respect to all sports in Division II, a member institution may administer such awards to any number of recipients on the basis of value (equivalency) as

A-51

long as, in the equivalency sports other than ice hockey in Division I, the total dollar amount of athletically related aid expended does not exceed the value of tuition and fees and, in the sport of ice hockey in Division I, the total dollar amount expended does not exceed the value of "commonly accepted educational expenses" at that institution multiplied by the number of maximum awards permitted for the particular sport in its division. The following computational method shall be utilized in administering this procedure:

"(1) The institution shall count in the equivalency sports other than ice hockey in Division I, the actual amount of athletically related money a student-athlete is awarded or receives for tuition and fees and, in the sport of ice hockey in Division I, the actual amount of money a student-athlete is awarded or receives for room, board, tuition and fees, as well as books (which may not exceed \$200 per academic year)."

Source: Boston University; Bowling Green State University; University of Minnesota; Twin Cities; University of New Hampshire; Western Michigan University; University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Action: Approved by Division I.

## NO. 78-2 FINANCIAL AID LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 78; Bylaw 6-5-(h), as follows:

[Division II only]

"(h) With respect to sports other than basketball in Division I, football in Division I-A and the total maximum awards limitation in football in Division I-AA, and with respect to all sports in Division II, a member institution may administer such awards to any number of recipients on the basis of value (equivalency) as long as, in the equivalency sports other than basketball and football in Division II, the total dollar amount of athletically related aid expended does not exceed the value of tuition and fees and, in the sports of basketball and football in Division II, the total dollar amount expended does not exceed the value of "commonly accepted educational expenses" at that institution multiplied by the number of maximum awards permitted for the particular sport in its division. The following computational method shall be utilized in administering this procedure:

"(1) The institution shall count in the equivalency sports other than basketball and football in Division II, the actual amount of athletically related money a student-athlete is awarded or receives for tuition and fees and, in the sports of basketball and football in Division II, the actual amount of money a student-athlete is awarded or receives for room, board, tuition and fees, as well as books (which may not exceed \$200 per academic year)."

Source: University of North Dakota.

Action: Defeated by Division II, 59-67.

## NO. 79 MAXIMUM AWARDS--DIVISION I-A FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(c), page 91, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"(c) Division I-A Football--There shall be an annual limit of 30 on the number of initial financial aid awards which may be made to student-athletes, and there shall be an annual limit of 95 on the total number of financial aid awards which may be in effect in the same year, including initial awards. In addition to the foregoing, financial aid may be awarded to five student-athletes who have completed a minimum of six semesters or nine quarters and who would otherwise be eligible for competition but who have discontinued their participation in the sport of football and who shall not subsequently be allowed to compete or practice in the sport of football."

Source: Clemson University; University of Florida; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Notre Dame; North Texas State University, and University of Oklahoma.

Intent: To permit an institution in Division I-A Football to award a maximum of five financial aid awards to student-athletes who have completed three academic years and otherwise would be eligible but who have discontinued participation in the sport of football.

Effective Date: August 1, 1982.

Action: Defeated by Division I-A Football.

## NO. 80 MAXIMUM AWARDS--DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(d), page 91, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"(d) Division I-AA Football--There shall be an annual limit of 30 on the number of initial financial aid awards which may be made to student-athletes, and there shall be an annual limit of 75 on the value of financial aid awards in effect the same year, including initial awards. The maximum awards may not be distributed to more than 95 student-athletes."

Source: All nine members of the Ohio Valley Conference.

Intent: To reduce the maximum awards limitation in Division I-AA Football from 75 to 65 (based on equivalencies) and to reduce the number of student-athletes to whom those awards may be distributed from 95 to 85.

Effective Date: August 1, 1983.

Action: Withdrawn.

## NO. 81 EXEMPTED PLAYERS--DIVISION II

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 4-(d), page 90, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(d) Was recruited and is receiving financial aid as to which there is on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty athletic representative and the director of financial aid that the student's financial aid was granted without regard in any degree to athletic ability. This applies only to sports other than football and basketball in Division I and to all sports in Division II, or"

**Source:** All 10 members of the North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

**Intent:** To exempt from the Bylaw 6 counting procedure in all sports a recruited athlete in Division II who is receiving financial aid not based upon athletic ability.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Approved by Division II.

## Membership and Classification

### NO. 82 SPORTS SPONSORSHIP

**Constitution:** Amend Article 4, Section 2-(g), page 27, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(g) With regard to active members, to sponsor and conduct a representative schedule in a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports which involve all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females and four varsity intercollegiate sports which involve all-female teams, according to the level of intercollegiate competition of a conference or an individual institution, with at least one sport involving an all-male team or a mixed team of males and females and at least one sport involving an all-female team conducted in every sport season.

[Subparagraphs (1) and (2) unchanged.]

"(3) If an active member no longer meets the *four-sport, three-season* requirements of Constitution 4-2-(g), it shall be reclassified immediately as an associate member.

"(4) Institutions which sponsor and conduct athletic programs for only one sex need not meet the four-sport, three-season requirement for the other sex; and institutions which do not affiliate their women's athletic programs with the NCAA need not meet the four-sport, three-season requirement for all-female teams in order to be eligible for active membership."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Special Committee on Legislative Review).

**Intent:** To require the sponsorship of the same minimum number of sports for men and for women for active membership in the NCAA and to provide exceptions for those institutions which sponsor athletic programs for only one sex or which do not affiliate their women's athletic programs with the NCAA.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1985.

**Action:** Approved.

### NO. 83 MEMBERSHIP DUES

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 8, Section 3-(a), page 99, by deleting the present language and substituting the following, renumbering subsequent paragraph:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 3. Dues of Members. (a) The annual dues of the various classes of membership shall be established by the Executive Committee, subject to the approval of the membership, to cover the direct costs of Association publications, Convention operations, establishment and maintenance of playing rules and compilation of statistics.

"(1) The dues shall be established on a two-to-one ratio for Division I and Divisions II and III, for both active and allied members.

"(2) After September 1, 1984, the Executive Committee shall be authorized to increase membership dues as needed to comply with the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section, but in no year after that date shall an increase in dues exceed the cumulative increase in the Consumer Price Index for the period since the most recent dues increase.

"(b) The annual dues of the various classes of membership, effective September 1, 1982, shall be:

"(1) Active members in Division I, \$800.

"(2) Active members in Division II, \$400.

"(3) Active members in Division III, \$400.

"(4) Allied members in Division I, \$400.

"(5) Allied members in Division II, \$200.

"(6) Allied members in Division III, \$200.

"(7) Associate members, \$100.

"(8) Affiliated members, \$100.

"(c) The annual dues of the various classes of membership, effective September 1, 1984, shall be:

"(1) Active members in Division I, \$1,400.

"(2) Active members in Division II, \$700.

"(3) Active members in Division III, \$700.

"(4) Allied members in Division I, \$700.

"(5) Allied members in Division II, \$350.

"(6) Allied members in Division III, \$350.

"(7) Associate members, \$175.

"(8) Affiliated members, \$175."

**Source:** NCAA Council and NCAA Executive Committee.

**Intent:** To specify in the bylaws that NCAA membership dues shall be based on the costs of providing certain basic membership services and to increase membership dues in two phases.

**Effective Date:** Immediately; dues increases to become effective

September 1, 1982, and September 1, 1984, as specified in the legislation.

**Action:** Approved by all divisions as amended by No. 83-1.

#### **NO. 83-1 MEMBERSHIP DUES**

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 83; Bylaw 8-3-(a), by deleting subparagraph (2), as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(2) After September 1, 1984, the Executive Committee shall be authorized to increase membership dues as needed to comply with the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section, but in no year after that date shall an increase in dues exceed the cumulative increase in the Consumer Price Index for the period since the most recent dues increase."

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Action:** Approved by all divisions.

#### **NO. 84 MEMBERSHIP CLASSIFICATION - DIVISION IV**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 9, Section 1-(a), page 102, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) Each active member institution shall be designated as a member of Division I, Division II or, Division III or Division IV for certain legislative and competitive purposes. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may permit an institution's women's athletic program to be classified in a division other than its membership division if it deems that unusual circumstances warrant such action. In the sport of football only, Division I shall be divided into Division I-A and Division I-AA; and the membership of these subdivisions shall vote separately on legislative issues which pertain only to the sport of football."

**Source:** University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Clemson University; University of Georgia; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma; Pennsylvania State University, and one other Division I member institution.

**Intent:** To create a new Division IV.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

#### **NO. 85 MULTIDIVISION CLASSIFICATION**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 9, Section 3-(a), page 105, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) A member of Division II or Division III may petition to be classified in Division I in any one men's sport, other than football or basketball, and in any one women's sport, other than basketball."

**Source:** All seven members of the Northern California Athletic Conference.

A-56

**Intent:** To prohibit Division II and Division III member institutions from having women's basketball teams classified in Division I.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

#### **NO. 86 RESOLUTION: MULTIDIVISION CLASSIFICATION**

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the membership of the NCAA has been greatly affected by rising costs of intercollegiate athletic programs; and

"Whereas, these rising costs have caused some members to eliminate or curtail some of their sports programs; and

"Whereas, the members of the NCAA must meet certain minimum standards for division membership; and

"Whereas, members are reluctant to schedule members of other divisions because of scheduling criteria; and

"Whereas, multidivision classification would significantly increase regional scheduling opportunities, reduce cost and save sports programs;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Classification Committee be authorized to conduct a mail ballot of the membership to determine interest in multidivision classification of sports programs.

"Be It Further Resolved, that if the majority of the membership votes in favor of multidivision classification, the NCAA Council shall draw up proposed legislation to be presented at the 1983 NCAA Convention for possible adoption."

**Source:** George Mason University, James Madison University, Old Dominion University, University of Richmond and College of William and Mary.

**Action:** Defeated.

#### **NO. 87 CHANGE OF DIVISION MEMBERSHIP**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 9, Section 4, page 106, by adding new paragraph (a), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) A member of Division I or Division III may petition to change its membership to Division II, and a member of Division II may petition to change its membership to either Division I or Division III."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Special Committee on NCAA Governance, Organization and Services).

**Intent:** To specify that an institution is permitted to move its membership classification only to an adjacent division.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Approved by all divisions.

A-57



## NO. 88 RESOLUTION: ESTABLISHMENT OF DIVISION IV

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the NCAA membership has exceeded 900 for the first time in the Association's 75-year history; and

"Whereas, the NCAA has expanded its scope of operations to include intercollegiate athletics for women; and

"Whereas, there is a significant diversity among the Association's members as to their philosophy and approach to intercollegiate athletics; and

"Whereas, there is a desire on the part of those universities with a major football program to remain members in good standing of the NCAA; and

"Whereas, there has been a recognition by the NCAA Council that there is a need to restructure the Association to accommodate the different interests that exist among the Association's diversified membership; and

"Whereas, there is a need to allow institutions to have a more direct opportunity to develop legislation which impacts upon the operation of their athletic programs;

"Now, Therefore, *Be It Resolved*, that a new legislative division shall be created to be designated as Division IV, with the understanding that until the 1983 NCAA annual Convention, the members of the newly created Division IV shall adhere to those bylaws related to recruiting, extra events, playing and practice seasons, eligibility, financial aid awards and personnel and squad limitations as would otherwise be applicable to members of Division I-A and Division I; further, that Division IV members may enter teams and individuals in Division I championships and personnel from Division IV institutions may continue to be appointed or elected to serve on appropriate committees in those positions that may be designated for Division I.

"*Be It Further Resolved*, that the members of Division IV shall be those NCAA member institutions which desire to be members and which:

1. Do not make an award of financial aid (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) in excess of the number permitted by the provisions of Bylaws 6-5-(a), (b), (c), (d) and (e).
2. Conduct regular-season competition under eligibility rules at least as stringent as those provisions of Bylaw 5 applicable to members of Division I.
3. Meet the requirements of subparagraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d) below.
  - (a) The institution must sponsor a minimum of eight varsity intercollegiate sports, including football, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Bylaw 10-4.
  - (b) The institution must schedule and play at least 70 percent of its football games against member institutions which meet the requirements of subparagraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d).
  - (c) The average attendance for the institution's home football games for the immediate past three-year period shall be a minimum of 20,000 in paid attendance per game.
  - (d) The stadium utilized regularly for the institution's home

A-58

games must contain a minimum of 30,000 permanent seats.

- (e) If an institution fails to meet the criteria set out in subparagraphs (b), (c) and (d) above, it may become a member of Division IV if it is a member of a football-playing conference having a minimum of seven football-playing institutions, more than half of which do meet each of the criteria set forth in those subparagraphs.

"*Be It Finally Resolved*, that the NCAA Classification Committee shall determine prior to the 77th annual Convention which member institutions qualify for membership in Division IV under the criteria set forth above, and the Division IV member institutions may vote at the 77th annual Convention to amend Bylaw 10 to establish Division IV membership criteria."

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Clemson University; University of Georgia; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma; Pennsylvania State University, and one other Division I member institution.

Action: Withdrawn.

## NO. 89 DIVISION IV CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, by adding new Section 4, page 114, renumbering subsequent section, as follows:

[Division IV only]

"Section 4. Criteria for Division IV Membership. (a) An institution desiring to be a member of Division IV shall not make an award of financial aid (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) in excess of the number permitted by the provisions of Bylaws 6-5-(a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) applicable to members of Division I and Division I-A Football.

"(b) A member of Division IV must conduct its regular-season competition under eligibility rules at least as stringent as those provisions of Bylaw 5 applicable to members of Division I.

"(c) An institution desiring to be a member of Division IV must meet the requirements of subparagraphs (1) through (4) below.

"(1) The institution must sponsor a minimum of eight varsity intercollegiate sports, including football. Such sponsorship shall be based upon the provisions of Section 5 of this article applicable to the members of Division I.

"(2) The institution must schedule and play at least 70 percent of its football games against members of Division IV.

"(3) The institution must have averaged more than 20,000 in paid attendance per home football game during the immediate past three-year period.

"(4) The stadium utilized regularly for the institution's home football games must contain a minimum of

A-59

30,000 permanent seats.

"(5) If an institution fails to meet the criteria set out in subparagraphs (2), (3) and (4) above, it may become a member of Division IV if it is a member of a football-playing conference having a minimum of seven football-playing institutions, more than half of which do meet each of the criteria set out above.

"(6) If an institution fails to meet the criteria set out in subparagraphs (2), (3) and (4) above, it may become a member of Division IV if it can establish that it has made a significant commitment to its intercollegiate football program and if its application for membership in Division IV is approved by at least two-thirds of the members of Division IV."

**Source:** University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Clemson University; University of Georgia; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma; Pennsylvania State University, and one other Division I member institution.

**Intent:** To establish criteria for Division IV membership.

**Effective Date:** September 1, 1982.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

#### NO. 90 SPORTS SPONSORSHIP CRITERIA

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 10, Section 4-(a), page 114, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(a) The sports designated to meet the sports sponsorship criteria in Sections 1 and 2 of this article must be among those in which the Association sponsors a championship meet or tournament, must be recognized by the institution as varsity intercollegiate sports and must involve all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females. A Division I institution may utilize indoor track or outdoor track, but not both, to meet the sports sponsorship criteria in Section 1 of this article."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Classification Committee).

**Intent:** To permit a Division I member to count indoor track or outdoor track, but not both, to meet the minimum sports sponsorship criteria established in Bylaws 10-(1)-(b), (e) and (f).

**Effective Date:** September 1, 1982.

**Action:** Defeated by Division I.

#### NO. 91 DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL CRITERIA

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 10, Section 1-(f)-(1), page 109, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"(1) The institution must sponsor a minimum of eight six varsity intercollegiate sports, including football, in Division I, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article."

A-60

**Source:** All nine members of the Ohio Valley Conference.

**Intent:** To reduce the sports sponsorship criterion from eight to six for Division I-AA Football classification.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

#### NO. 92 DIVISION II CRITERIA

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 10, Section 2-(b), page 110, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(b) An institution desiring to be a member of Division II must sponsor a minimum of six four varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, in Division II, with such sponsorship based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. An institution which was a member of Division II as of January 13, 1978, shall conform to this criterion no later than January 13, 1981. An institution which applies for Division II membership subsequent to January 13, 1978, must meet this criterion prior to making application."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

**Intent:** To reduce from six to four the sports sponsorship criterion for membership in Division II and to specify that at least two sports must be team sports per NCAA definition.

**Effective Date:** September 1, 1982.

**Action:** Defeated by Division II, 64-71. Subsequent motion to reconsider defeated.

#### NO. 93 DIVISION II CRITERIA

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 10, Section 2, pages 110-111, by adding new paragraph (c), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(c) An institution desiring to be a member of Division II must conduct its regular-season competition under eligibility rules at least as stringent as those provisions of Bylaw 5 applicable to members of Division II. An institution which was a member of Division II as of September 1, 1982, shall conform to this criterion no later than September 1, 1984. An institution which applies for Division II membership subsequent to September 1, 1982, must meet this criterion prior to making application."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

**Intent:** To require each member institution in Division II to conduct its regular-season competition under eligibility rules as demanding as those of the NCAA regulations governing postseason competition.

**Effective Date:** September 1, 1982; subject to the compliance provisions of Bylaw 9-1-(c)-(1) as stated.

A-61

Action: Approved by Division II.

#### NO. 94 MEMBERSHIP CLASSIFICATION—DIVISION III-A

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 9, Section 1-(a), page 102, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 1. Determination of Divisions. (a) Each active member shall be designated as a member of Division I, Division II or Division III for certain legislative and competitive purposes. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may permit an institution's women's athletic program to be classified in a division other than its membership division if it deems that unusual circumstances warrant such action. In the sport of football only, Division I shall be divided into Division I-A and Division I-AA; and the membership of these subdivisions shall vote separately on legislative issues which pertain only to the sport of football. Division III shall be divided into Division III and Division III-A for certain legislative and competitive purposes; and the membership of these subdivisions shall vote separately on legislative issues which pertain only to one of the subdivisions."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 3, pages 111-114, by adding new paragraph (g), as follows:

[Division III only]

"(g) An institution desiring to be a member of Division III-A must meet the requirements of this section and have an undergraduate enrollment of 3,500 or fewer students."

Source: Carleton College, University of Chicago, Knox College, Lake Forest College, Lawrence University, Monmouth College (Illinois) and eight other Division III member institutions.

Intent: To create a Division III-A with all of the existing Division III membership criteria as well as a maximum undergraduate enrollment limitation of 3,500 students.

Effective Date: September 1, 1982; subject to the compliance provisions of Bylaw 9-1-(c)-(1).

Action: Withdrawn.

#### NO. 95 DIVISION III CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 3, pages 111-114, by adding new paragraph (b), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(b) An institution desiring to be a member of Division III must have an undergraduate enrollment of 3,500 or fewer students."

Source: Carleton College, University of Chicago, Elizabethtown College, Lawrence University, Manhattanville College, Mount Union College and 13 other Division III member institutions.

Intent: To limit the undergraduate enrollment of Division III institutions to 3,500 students.

Effective Date: September 1, 1982; subject to the compliance provisions of Bylaw 9-1-(c)-(1).

Action: Defeated by Division III.

#### Recruiting

##### NO. 96 TRYOUTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 6, pages 48-49, by deleting paragraphs (a) and (e) and adding new paragraph (a), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) A member institution may conduct a tryout of a prospective student-athlete only on its campus and only under the following conditions:

"(1) No more than one tryout per prospective student-athlete per institution shall be permitted.

"(2) The tryout may be conducted only after the prospective student-athlete has completed high school eligibility in the sport or, for a junior college student, after the conclusion of the sport season.

"(3) A medical examination of a prospective student-athlete conducted by an institution's regular team physician or other designated physician shall be permitted as a part of the tryout.

"(4) The tryout may include tests to evaluate the prospective student-athlete's strength, speed, agility and sports skills. Except in the sports of football, wrestling, ice hockey and lacrosse, the tryout may include competition.

"(5) The time of the tryout activities (other than the physical examination) shall be limited to the length of the institution's normal practice period in the sport but shall in no event be longer than two hours.

"(6) The institution may provide equipment and clothing on an issuance-and-retrieval basis to a prospective student-athlete during the period of the tryout."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Legislative Review).

Intent: To permit tryouts for prospective student-athletes under the limited circumstances set forth in the proposal.

Effective Date: August 1, 1982.

Action: Referred to NCAA Recruiting Committee for study. Motion approved by all divisions.

##### NO. 97 TRYOUTS

Amend Proposal No. 96, Bylaws 1-6(a)-(4), (5) and (6), by deleting the

present (4) and substituting the following, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(4) The tryout shall be limited to prescribed physical activities (as approved in written form by the institutional authority responsible for determining athletic policy) designed to evaluate the prospective student-athlete's strength, speed and agility. All such tryouts shall be restricted to noncontact drills, and no protective athletic equipment shall be issued or worn other than shoes. Combative or scrimmage drills of any kind shall be prohibited, and the permissible tryout activity may not involve the prospective student-athlete being tested directly against another athlete or athletes.

"(5) The time of the tryout activities (other than the physical examination) shall be limited to the length of the institution's normal practice period in the sport, but shall in no event be longer than two a maximum of one hour.

"(6) The institution may provide equipment shoes and clothing on an issuance-and-retrieval basis to a prospective student-athlete during the period of the tryout."

**Source:** Boston University; University of Maine, Orono; University of Massachusetts, Amherst; University of New Hampshire; Northeastern University, and University of Vermont.

**Action:** Defeated by all divisions.

#### NO. 98 RECRUITING CONTACTS

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(1)-(i), page 44, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(i) *Three additional in-person* Each week during the contact period, one off-campus contacts per prospect shall be permitted by each member institution on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution and with the written approval of that institution's executive officer or the executive officer's designated representative."

**Source:** Clemson University; University of Kansas; Kansas State University; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of Nebraska, Lincoln, and University of Oklahoma.

**Intent:** To permit one in-person, off-campus recruiting contact per week per prospective student-athlete during the contact period on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution and with the approval of the institution's executive officer or designate.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Defeated by Divisions I and II.

#### NO. 99 RECRUITING CONTACTS

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(1) and (2), pages 43-44, as follows:

[Division I-A Football only]

"(1) Three such contacts (at sites other than the prospect's educational institution) per prospective student-athlete prior to and on the occasion on which the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent, which shall include contacts with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian, shall be permitted by each member institution.

[Subparagraphs (i), (ii) and (iii) unchanged]

"(2) Any face-to-face encounter (between a prospective student-athlete and a member institution's staff member or athletic representative) away from the grounds of the prospect's educational institution during which any dialogue occurs in excess of an exchange of greeting shall be considered a contact. This provision also applies to any face-to-face encounter, in excess of an exchange of greeting, between a prospect's relatives or legal guardian and a member institution's staff member or athletic representative. Further, any face-to-face encounter which is by prearrangement or which takes place on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution or at the site of organized competition and practice involving the prospect or the team (i.e., high school, preparatory school, junior college or all-star team) the prospect represents shall be considered a contact, regardless of the conversation which occurs."

**Source:** All eight members of the Big Eight Conference.

**Intent:** To specify that the three-contact recruiting limitation shall not apply to contacts with football prospects by Division I-A institutions on the occasion on which the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent or on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Referred to NCAA Recruiting Committee. Motion approved by Division I-A Football.

#### NO. 100 WOMEN'S BASKETBALL RECRUITING

**A. Bylaws:** Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(5), page 45, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(5) Such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of basketball only during the period between August 1 and October 1 and the period between March 1 (or the date of the completion of the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college contest, if it occurs thereafter) and May 15. [Note: During the period between August 1, 1981, and August 1, 1985, contacts with prospective student-athletes being recruited to participate on a member institution's women's intercollegiate basketball team shall be exempt from the provisions of this subparagraph.]"

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Article 1, Section 3, page 46, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"Section 3. Evaluation Periods. The involvement of institu-



tional staff members or representatives of athletic interests in off-campus scouting activities designed to evaluate the academic standing and playing ability of prospective student-athletes in the sports of basketball and football shall be restricted to the permissible periods for in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts in those sports except as follows: [Note: During the period between August 1, 1981, and August 1, 1985, such scouting activities related to prospective student-athletes being recruited to participate on a member institution's women's intercollegiate basketball team shall be exempt from the provisions of this section.]"

[Paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Council (Special Committee on Legislative Review).

**Intent:** To exempt contact with and evaluation of prospective student-athletes being recruited during the period between August 1, 1981, and August 1, 1985, to participate on a Division I or Division II member institution's women's basketball team from the limitations set forth in Bylaws 1-2-(a)-(5) and 1-3.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Approved by Division I, 155-96, and by Division II.

#### **NO. 101 BASKETBALL RECRUITING SEASON**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(5), page 45, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(5) Such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of basketball only during the period between August 1 and October 1 and the period between March 1 (or the date of the completion of the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college contest, if it occurs thereafter) and May 15, except that in any state where women's high school basketball is played during the fall season, such contacts with prospects in that state shall be permissible in the sport of women's basketball only during the period between January 1 and March 15."

**Source:** All 10 members of the Mid-American Athletic Conference.

**Intent:** To permit in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts in the sport of women's basketball for Divisions I and II only during the period between January 1 and March 15 in states where women's high school basketball is played during the fall season.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

#### **NO. 102 BASKETBALL RECRUITING SEASON**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(5), page 45, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(5) Such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of basketball only during the period between August 1 September 1 and October 1 November 1 and the period between March 1 (or the date

of the completion of the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college contest, if it occurs thereafter) and May 15."

**Source:** Fairfield University, Fordham University, Iona College, Manhattan College, St. Peter's College and U.S. Military Academy.

**Intent:** To change the starting date for recruiting contacts in the sport of basketball for Divisions I and II member institutions from August 1 to September 1 and the closing date from October 1 to November 1.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Approved by Divisions I and II.

#### **NO. 103 BASKETBALL EVALUATION PERIODS**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 1, Section 3-(a), page 46, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(a) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of basketball during the period between June 15 and August 1 and the period between December 1 and March 1 (or the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college contest), except that in any state where the state high school athletic association has approved a playing season other than between December 1 and March 1, scouting activities concerning prospects in that state shall be permissible during the high school season rather than the December 1 to March 1 period."

**Source:** Augustana College (South Dakota); Indiana State University, Terre Haute; University of Nebraska, Omaha; University of North Dakota; North Dakota State University, and University of South Dakota.

**Intent:** To permit the evaluation of prospective student-athletes during their season in states where the high school basketball season is conducted other than between December 1 and March 1.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

#### **NO. 104 INSTITUTIONAL LETTER-OF-INTENT**

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(1)-(iii), page 44, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(iii) No member institution may participate in an institutional or a conference letter-of-intent program which involves a signing date in the sport of football or basketball that precedes the initial signing date for that sport in the National Letter of Intent program."

**Source:** Appalachian State University; The Citadel; East Tennessee State University; Furman University; Marshall University; University of Tennessee, Chattanooga, and two other Division I

member institutions.

**Intent:** To permit a member institution to participate in an institutional letter-of-intent program which involves a signing date in the sport of football or basketball that precedes the initial signing date in the National Letter of Intent program.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Defeated by Divisions I and II.

#### NO. 105 RECRUITING-PUBLICITY

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 1, Section 4, page 47, by adding new paragraph (b), relettering subsequent paragraph, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"(b) The head football coach of a Division I-A member institution shall not be present when an off-campus site is utilized for purposes of obtaining a prospective student-athlete's signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission as a student or written tender of financial assistance to be provided on the prospect's enrollment."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

**Intent:** To preclude a Division I-A head football coach from participating in the off-campus signing of a prospective student-athlete.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Approved by Division I-A Football.

#### NO. 106 EXPENSE-PAID VISITS

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 1, Section 8-(e), page 51, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(e) Divisions I and II-A prospect may accept not more than one expense-paid visit to not more than six five member institutions. Each Division I or II member institution shall be required to notify in writing, at the time of its invitation, each prospective student-athlete whom it invites to receive an expense-paid visit of the limitations imposed by this bylaw; further, that invitation and notification shall occur at least five calendar days in advance of the visit."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee, Special Committee on Legislative Review).

**Intent:** To reduce from six to five the total number of expense-paid visits which a prospective student-athlete may receive from Divisions I and II member institutions.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Approved by Division I, 146-121, and by Division II.

A-68

#### NO. 107 COMPLIMENTARY MEAL

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 1, Section 8-(f), page 51, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(f) A prospective student-athlete may visit a member institution's campus at the prospect's own expense as often as the prospect wishes. During such visits, the institution may not pay any expense or provide any entertainment except a meal in the institution's on-campus student dining facilities and a maximum of three complimentary admissions to a campus athletic event for the exclusive use of admitting the prospective student-athlete and those persons accompanying the prospect on the visit. Payment of any expenses or providing any entertainment, except as noted, on such a trip shall constitute an expense-paid trip."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

**Intent:** To eliminate complimentary meals for a prospect visiting a campus at the prospect's own expense.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Approved by Division I, 133-131. Subsequent motion to reconsider defeated.

#### NO. 108 RECRUITING-ENTERTAINMENT

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 1, Section 8-(j)-(2)-(i), page 52, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(i) In either case, a student host may be provided with a maximum of \$10 \$20 for each day of the visit to cover actual and necessary expenses."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

**Intent:** To permit an institution to provide a student host a maximum of \$20 per day to cover actual and necessary expenses to entertain a prospective student-athlete on an official visit. [Note: Case No. 236 would be revised to permit the institution to provide the student host with an additional \$10 per day for each additional prospect the host actually entertains.]

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Approved by Division I. Defeated by Division II, 48-77, and by Division III.

#### Championships

#### NO. 109 CONTINUATION OF CHAMPIONSHIPS

**Executive Regulations:** Amend Regulation 2, Sections 1-(a) and (c), pages 134-135, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(a) The following criteria shall apply to sports in which the

A-69

Association had established championships prior to the 1979-80 academic year.

"(1) A National Collegiate Championship [per Constitution 5-7-(e)] in such a sport may be *continued* or established if at least seven percent of the active members of the Association sponsor the sport on a varsity intercollegiate basis.

"(2) If at least seven percent of the active members sponsor the sport, a division championship [per Constitution 5-7-(f)] in that sport may be *continued* or established if 20 percent of the division's active members sponsor the sport on a varsity intercollegiate basis.

[Paragraph (b) unchanged.]

"(c) If any championship which had not been established prior to the 1979-80 academic year falls below the percentage set forth in Executive Regulations 2-1-(a)-(1) and (2) and Executive Regulations 2-1-(b)-(1) and (2) for two consecutive years, the championship automatically shall be discontinued, except that a championship in which net receipts exceed all expenses (including the transportation and per diem expenses as specified in Executive Regulation 2-11) shall be exempt from this provision. The determination of receipts and expenses shall be based upon a moving three-year average. **No championship established prior to the 1979-80 academic year shall be discontinued.**"

**Source:** City College of New York; Eastern Montana College; Frostburg State College; University of Illinois, Chicago Circle; University of Lowell; University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh, and three other Division III member institutions.

**Intent:** To prohibit championships established prior to the 1979-80 academic year from being discontinued.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Approved as amended by No. 190-1.

## NO. 109-1 CONTINUATION OF CHAMPIONSHIPS

**Executive Regulations:** Amend Proposal No. 109; Executive Regulation 2-1-(a) and (c), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(a) The following criteria shall apply to sports in which the Association had established championships prior to the 1979-80 academic year.

"(1) A National Collegiate Championship [per Constitution 5-7-(e)] in such a sport may be **continued** or established if at least seven percent of the active members of the Association sponsor the sport on a varsity intercollegiate basis.

"(2) If at least seven percent of the active members sponsor the sport, a division championship [per Constitution 5-7-(f)] in the sport may be **continued** or established if 20 percent of the division's active members sponsor the sport on a

varsity intercollegiate basis.

[Paragraph (b) unchanged.]

"(c) If any championship which had not been established prior to the 1979-80 academic year falls below the percentage set forth in Executive Regulations 2-1-(a)-(1) and (2) and Executive Regulations 2-1-(b)-(1) and (2) for two consecutive years, the championship automatically shall be discontinued, except that a championship in which net receipts exceed all expenses (including the transportation and per diem expenses as specified in Executive Regulation 2-11) shall be exempt from this provision. The determination of receipts and expenses shall be based upon a moving three-year average. No championship established prior to the 1979-80 1981-82 academic year shall be discontinued **prior to the 1984 Olympic Games.**"

**Source:** University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles, University of Southern California; Stanford University.

**Action:** Approved.

## NO. 110 ELIGIBILITY FOR DIVISION I CHAMPIONSHIPS

**Executive Regulations:** Amend Regulation 2, Section 3, page 139, by deleting paragraph (c), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) In individual-team championships, member institutions from Division II and Division III may enter student-athletes in Division I meets and tournaments, provided the institution is in good standing and the individuals meet the prevailing eligibility requirements, including those in Bylaw 9-6-(e), and the following individual criteria of successful performance in the particular Division II or Division III championship:

"(1) Cross Country—first six finishers in Division II and first four finishers in Division III.

"(2) Men's Golf—first four finishers in Division II and first two finishers in Division III. In the event of a tie for any of these positions, a sudden-death playoff shall be held immediately to determine which athletes may advance.

"(3) Gymnastics—first two finishers in each event and first two finishers in all-around competition in Division II.

"(4) Swimming—first four finishers in each Division II event and first two finishers in each Division III event, provided they meet the minimum performance standards established by the appropriate Swimming Committee.

"(5) Tennis—first four finishers in singles and first four finishers in doubles in Division II, and first two finishers in singles and first two finishers in doubles in Division III.

"(6) Outdoor Track—first four finishers in each Division II event and first two finishers in each Division III event, provided they meet the minimum performance standards established by the appropriate Track and Field Committee.

"(7) Men's Wrestling—champion in each weight classification in Division II and Division III, plus additional at-large selections from the respective tournament as may be recommended annually by the Men's Wrestling Committee and approved by the Executive Committee. In the event an athlete from

*Division II or Division III qualifies for the Division I championships but is unable to participate in that tournament, such position shall be vacated in the Division I tournament and a replacement may not be appointed."*

**Source:** NCAA Executive Committee.

**Intent:** To eliminate the opportunity for Division II and Division III member institutions to enter student-athletes in the specified Division I meets and tournaments. [Note: Bylaw 9-6-(e) would be deleted.]

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Defeated.

#### NO. 111 ELIGIBILITY FOR DIVISION I CHAMPIONSHIPS

**Executive Regulations:** Amend Regulation 2, Section 3-(c), page 139, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) In individual-team championships, member institutions from Division II and Division III may enter student-athletes in Division I meets and tournaments, provided the institution is in good standing and the individuals meet the prevailing eligibility requirements, including those in Bylaw 9-6-(e), and the following individual criteria of successful performance in the particular Division II or Division III championships:

"(1) Cross Country—first six two finishers in Division II and first four finishers in Division III.

"(2) Men's Golf—first four two finishers in Division II and first two finishers in Division III. In the event of a tie for any of these positions, a sudden-death playoff shall be held immediately to determine which athletes may advance.

[Subparagraph (3) unchanged.]

"(4) Swimming—first four two finishers in each Division II event and first two finishers in each Division III event, provided they meet the minimum performance standards established by the appropriate Swimming Committee.

"(5) Tennis—first four two finishers in singles and first four two finishers in doubles in Division II, and first two finishers in singles and first two finishers in doubles in Division III.

"(6) Outdoor Track—first four two finishers in each Division II event and first two finishers in each Division III event, provided they meet the minimum performance standards established by the appropriate Track and Field Committee."

[Subparagraph (7) unchanged.]

**Source:** Cheyney State College, Ferris State College, Livingston University, Northeast Missouri State University, Southwest Missouri State University, Tuskegee Institute and one other Division II member institution.

**Intent:** To reduce to two the number of Division II participants who

would be permitted to enter the Division I championships in each instance specified in the executive regulation except wrestling.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Approved.

#### NO. 112 ELIGIBILITY FOR DIVISION I CHAMPIONSHIPS

**Executive Regulations:** Amend Regulation 2, Section 3-(c), page 139, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) In individual-team championships, member institutions from Division II and Division III may enter student-athletes in Division I meets and tournaments, provided the institution is in good standing and the individuals meet the prevailing eligibility requirements, including those in Bylaw 9-6-(e), and the following individual criteria of successful performance in the particular Division II or Division III championships:

"(1) Cross Country—first six finishers in Division II and first four finishers in Division III.

"(2) Men's Golf—first four finishers in Division II and first two finishers in Division III. In the event of a tie for any of these positions, a sudden-death playoff shall be held immediately to determine which athletes may advance.

[Subparagraph (3) unchanged.]

"(4) Swimming—first four finishers in each Division II event and first two finishers in each Division III event, provided they meet the minimum performance standards established by the appropriate Swimming Committee.

"(5) Tennis—first four finishers in singles and first four finishers in doubles in Division II and first two finishers in singles and first two finishers in doubles in Division III.

"(6) Outdoor Track—first four finishers in each Division II event and first two finishers in each Division III event, provided they meet the minimum performance standards established by the appropriate Track and Field Committee."

[Subparagraph (7) unchanged.]

**Source:** Amherst College, Bates College, Connecticut College, Trinity College, Wesleyan University and Williams College.

**Intent:** To reduce to one the number of Division III participants who would be permitted to enter the Division I championships in each instance specified in the executive regulation except wrestling.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1982.

**Action:** Approved.

#### NO. 113 WOMEN'S INDOOR TRACK CHAMPIONSHIPS

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 5, Section 6, page 83, by adding the following:  
[All divisions, common vote]



**"National Collegiate Women's Indoor Track Championships"**

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Intent:** To establish the National Collegiate Women's Indoor Track Championships.

**Effective Date:** Immediately; first championships to be conducted in the 1982-83 academic year.

**Action:** Approved.

**NO. 114 WOMEN'S SOCCER CHAMPIONSHIP**

**A. Bylaws:** Amend Article 5, Section 6, page 83, by adding the following:

[All divisions, common vote]

**"National Collegiate Women's Soccer Championship"**

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Article 11, Section 5, by adding new paragraph (q), page 130, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

**"(q) The Women's Soccer Committee shall consist of six members, including three members from Division I, one member from Division II, one member from Division III and one member elected at large."**

**Source:** NCAA Council (Special Committee on Legislative Review).

**Intent:** To establish a National Collegiate Women's Soccer Championship and to establish a Women's Soccer Committee.

**Effective Date:** Immediately; first championship to be conducted in the 1982-83 academic year.

**Action:** Approved.

**NO. 115 WOMEN'S SKIING CHAMPIONSHIPS**

**A. Bylaws:** Amend Article 5, Section 6, page 83, by adding the following:

[All divisions, common vote]

**"National Collegiate Women's Skiing Championships"**

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Article 11, Section 5, by adding new paragraph (q), page 130, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

**"(q) The Women's Skiing Committee shall consist of six members, including three members from Division I, one member from Division II, one member from Division III and one member elected at large."**

**Source:** University of Colorado, University of Denver, University of New Hampshire, University of New Mexico, University of Utah, University of Wyoming and two other Division I and four Division III member institutions.

**Intent:** To establish the National Collegiate Women's Skiing Championships and to establish a Women's Skiing Committee.

**Effective Date:** Immediately; first championships to be conducted in the 1982-83 academic year.

**Action:** Ruled out of order per provisions of Executive Regulation 2-1-(a).

**NO. 115-1 RESOLUTION: WOMEN'S SKIING CHAMPIONSHIPS**

[All divisions, common vote]

**"Be It Resolved,** that the NCAA Executive Committee be authorized to establish a pilot program for the 1982-83 academic year in conjunction with the National Collegiate Men's Skiing Championships which will provide for women's teams and/or individual competitors in championship skiing events with awards commensurate to those for men. Any authorized payments for transportation and per diem expenses for competitors shall be paid only for those teams or competitors which meet the sponsorship criteria of Executive Regulation 2-1-(a). The program shall otherwise be conducted in accordance with all other pertinent Association legislation."

**Source:** University of Colorado, University of New Hampshire, University of New Mexico, St. Michael's College, University of Utah, University of Vermont, University of Wyoming.

**Action:** Defeated.

**NO. 116 INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS**

**Executive Regulations:** Amend Regulation 2, Section 3, pages 138-141, by adding new paragraph (i), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

**"(i) If an allied conference, which conducts its regular-season competition under eligibility rules at least as stringent as those provisions of Bylaw 5 applicable to its members, conducts a championship in a team sport (and has conducted a championship in that sport for at least two consecutive years) and at least two-thirds of the conference member institutions sponsor the sport as a varsity intercollegiate sport, the governing sports committee must select the official conference champion to participate in a national championship before it may select any other team from that conference or any other at-large team. This paragraph shall apply to team championships in the women's sports of softball, basketball, golf, gymnastics, field hockey, tennis and volleyball."**

**Source:** Iowa State University; University of Kansas; Kansas State University; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma, and Oklahoma State University.

**Intent:** To require that the champion of an allied conference be selected for national championships for women in the specified sports prior to the selection of other teams from that conference or any other at-large team.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Referred to Special Committee on Legislative Review.

#### NO. 117 RESOLUTION: DIVISION I MEN'S BASKETBALL

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the NCAA Executive Committee has voted that beginning in 1983, not more than 50 percent of the positions in the bracket for the Division I Men's Basketball Championships may be allocated to champions of automatic-qualifying conferences; and

"Whereas, there are currently more Division I allied basketball-playing conferences which meet the requirements for automatic qualification set forth in Bylaw 5-7 and Executive Regulation 2-6 than there are positions in the tournament bracket for conference champions if the 50 percent limitation is applied; and

"Whereas, it is important to the viability of an allied conference that its basketball champion automatically receive a position in the bracket for the Division I Men's Basketball Championships;

"Now, Therefore, *Be It Resolved*, that the Executive Committee be directed to specify that in the 1983 Division I Men's Basketball Championship, a position in the bracket for that championship be allocated to the champion of each automatic-qualifying conference; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the Executive Committee be directed to study methods to accommodate all champions of automatic-qualifying conferences in all future Division I Men's Basketball Championships."

**Source:** All nine members of the Trans America Athletic Conference.  
**Action:** Approved.

#### NO. 118 RESOLUTION: DIVISION I MEN'S BASKETBALL

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the NCAA Executive Committee has voted that beginning in 1983, not more than 50 percent of the positions in the bracket for the Division I Men's Basketball Championships may be allocated to champions of automatic-qualifying conferences; and

"Whereas, the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Committee has recommended to the Executive Committee, for consideration in the latter's January 1982 meeting, that the 50 percent limitation be reduced to 40 percent; and

"Whereas, any action by the Executive Committee to approve the 40 percent recommendation could not be acted upon by the NCAA membership until the NCAA Convention in January 1983, only two months prior to the 1983 tournament;

"Now, Therefore, *Be It Resolved*, that the Executive Committee be directed to specify that in the 1983 Division I Men's Basketball Championship, 50 percent of the positions in the bracket for that championship shall be allocated to champions of automatic-qualifying conferences."

**Source:** All seven members of the Midwestern City Conference.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

### Governance

#### NO. 119-1 RESOLUTION: NCAA COUNCIL

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, Proposal No. 119 is a constructive attempt to obtain adequate representation on the NCAA Council for certain membership interests; and

"Whereas, the NCAA Council believes that neither the present representation formula for the Council positions nor Proposal No. 119 adequately addresses the interests of Divisions I-A and I-AA Football as restructured by the special Convention in December, and recognizes that Proposal No. 119 was submitted prior to that restructuring; and

"Whereas, it was not feasible for the Council to prepare in legislative form a Council restructuring proposal until after the decisions of the December special Convention which, of course, occurred after the amendment deadline for this Convention;

"Now, Therefore, *Be It Resolved*, that the Council shall submit legislation for consideration at the 1983 Convention that would restructure the Council by (i) expanding it to approximately 32 to 40 members by incorporating, all or in part, the existing division steering committees; (ii) retaining the current 2-1-1 representation ratio among Divisions I, II and III; (iii) assuring guaranteed representation for each Division I-A Football conference, each of the four Division I-AA Football regions and other major interests within Division I; (iv) providing that the membership of each division shall elect its own members of the Council, and (v) establishing a partially federated Council meeting concept, with the division units meeting separately to act upon matters pertaining exclusively to their respective divisions and the entire Council meeting to consider issues of overall Association policy and matters of interdivision interests."

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Action:** Approved.

#### NO. 119 NCAA COUNCIL

**Constitution:** Amend Article 5, Section 1-(a), pages 31-32, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 1. Council. The establishment and direction of the general policy of the Association in the interim between Conventions is committed to a Council of 22 30 members, including at least

four women, which shall be elected at the annual Convention of the Association.

"(a) The Council shall be constituted as follows:

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) Eight Sixteen members of the Council shall consist of the eight 16 district vice-presidents, two from each district, of this Association. One vice-president in each district shall represent a Division I-A member institution and shall be elected by the Division I-A members in that district at the annual Convention to serve for a term of four years. The other vice-president in each district shall be elected by the Association at the annual Convention to serve for a term of four years.

"(i) The terms of no more than two district vice-presidents shall expire in any one year. The district vice-presidents representing even-numbered districts shall be elected at Conventions held in odd-numbered years; the district vice-presidents representing odd-numbered districts shall be elected at Conventions held in even-numbered years.

[Subparagraphs (2)-(ii) and (iii) and (3) unchanged.]

"(4) Among the 20 28 vice-presidents, 10 18 shall represent Division I members, including at least eight from Division I-A members; five shall represent Division II members, and five shall represent Division III members.

"(5) The 20 28 vice-presidents shall represent their respective divisions as members of Council subcommittees identified as Division I, Division II and Division III Steering Committees."

[Subparagraphs (5)-(i), (ii), (iii) and (iv), (6) and (7) unchanged.]

**Source:** University of Colorado; Iowa State University; University of Kansas; Kansas State University; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma, and one other Division I member institution.

**Intent:** To increase the membership of the NCAA Council from 22 to 30 by adding eight positions for Division I representatives, and to specify that there shall be two vice-presidents from each district, with one from each district to represent Division I-A Football.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

## NO. 120 NCAA COUNCIL

**Constitution:** Amend Article 5, Section 1-(a), page 31, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(a) The Council shall be constituted as follows:

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) Eight members of the Council shall consist of the eight district

vice-presidents of this Association, elected by the Association at the annual Convention to serve for a term of four years.

"(i) The terms of no more than two district vice-presidents shall expire in any one year. The district vice-presidents representing even-numbered districts shall be elected at Conventions held in odd-numbered years; the district vice-presidents representing odd-numbered districts shall be elected at Conventions held in even-numbered years.

"(ii) District vice-presidents are not eligible for election to another term on the Council until two years have elapsed.

"(iii) Each district vice-president shall represent the interests of that district, carefully observe the conduct of intercollegiate athletics within the district and advance such suggestions and recommendations as are deemed advisable, and perform such other duties as the president may direct.

"(2) The Council shall consist of five representatives of Division I, five representatives of Division II, five representatives of Division III and five representatives of Division IV. One of the representatives from each division shall be a woman.

"(3) Twelve vice-presidents at large shall be elected by the Association at the annual Convention to serve for a term of four years. The terms of no more than three vice-presidents at large shall expire in any one year. Vice-presidents at large shall not be eligible for election to another term on the Council until two years have elapsed.

"(3) Each division shall be responsible for electing its representatives to serve on the NCAA Council at the division round-table meetings at the annual Convention.

"(4) Among the 20 vice-presidents, 10 shall represent Division I members, five shall represent Division II members and five shall represent Division III members.

"(4) Council members shall be elected for three-year terms. No person may serve on the Council for more than two terms.

"(5) The 20 vice-presidents Council members shall represent their respective divisions as members of the Council subcommittees identified as Division I, Division II and, Division III and Division IV Steering Committees.

[Subparagraphs (5)-(i) and (ii) unchanged.]

"(iii) For purposes of meetings conducted separately from regular meetings of the Council, each division steering committee may appoint additional members to serve on the committee subject to approval of the Council and limited to a number not exceeding the number of Council members on the steering committee. The Council shall adopt a formula for such appointments to assure adequate representation of the membership of each division.

"(iv) The Division I Steering Committee shall include six positions allocated for men, six allocated for women and eight unallocated. The Division II and Division III Steering Committees each shall include three

positions allocated for men, three allocated for women and four unallocated.

"(iv) Each division shall be responsible for determining the size and composition of its steering committee, with the understanding that there be specific positions allocated for both men and women.

[Subparagraph (6) unchanged.]

"(7) The membership of a 'playing conference' (i.e., one which conducts a regular conference schedule or a postseason meet or tournament to determine its champion in football or basketball) may not be represented on the Council by more than one individual, excluding the president and secretary-treasurer, except that a woman serve on the Council may represent the same playing conference as a man serving on the Council."

**Source:** University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Clemson University; University of Georgia; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma; Pennsylvania State University, and one other Division I member institution.

**Intent:** To provide for Division IV representation on the Council; to allow representatives on the Council to be selected by vote of the members of each division; to specify terms of Council members; to determine representation on division steering committees, and to eliminate the exception that permits a man and a woman from the same playing conference to serve on the Council.

**Effective Date:** Immediately after the 77th annual Convention.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

#### NO. 121 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**Constitution:** Amend Article 5, Section 2-(a)-(3), page 33, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(3) Among the ten members elected by the Council, ~~six~~ **three** shall represent Division I members, **three** shall represent Division IV members and four shall represent Division II and Division III members, with each of the latter divisions being represented by at least one member."

**Source:** University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Clemson University; University of Georgia; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma; Pennsylvania State University, and one other Division I member institution.

**Intent:** To provide for Division IV representation on the Executive Committee.

**Effective Date:** Immediately after the 77th annual Convention.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

#### NO. 122 DIVISION IV COMMITTEES

**Bylaws:** Amend Article 11 by adding new Section 4, page 124,

renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 4. Division-Appointed Committees. Representation on Division IV committees shall be determined by the Division IV members as follows: Each conference classified as Division IV shall appoint one member to each Division IV committee. Those institutions not affiliated with a Division IV conference shall appoint a total of two members to represent them on each of the Division IV committees.

"(a) The Division IV Football Television Committee shall be responsible for the formulation and administration of the Division IV football television policy and program, subject to the approval of the Division IV membership.

"(b) The Division IV Postseason Football Committee shall be responsible for the certification of postseason football games, and its duties and functions are set forth in Bylaws 2-1 and 2-2."

**Source:** University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Clemson University; University of Georgia; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma; Pennsylvania State University, and one other Division I member institution.

**Intent:** To provide an opportunity for Division IV members to select their representatives on specific committees and to establish a Division IV Football Television Committee and a Division IV Postseason Football Committee.

**Effective Date:** Immediately after the 77th annual Convention.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

#### NO. 123 RESOLUTION: ACADEMIC TRUST FUND

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the NCAA is an organization whose purposes are to: initiate, stimulate and improve intercollegiate athletic programs for student-athletes and to promote and develop educational leadership, physical fitness, sports participation as a recreational pursuit and athletic excellence' (Constitution Article 2, Section 1), and

"Whereas, the NCAA has for 76 years dedicated itself to advancing the educational, moral, physical and psychological needs of student-athletes; and

"Whereas, the NCAA has throughout its 76 years adjusted and amended its constitution and bylaws to facilitate and advance the educational needs of student-athletes in its member institutions; and

"Whereas, in the 1980s, the increased revenues available to the NCAA through cablecasting and television revenues will provide an even greater opportunity to address the educational needs of student-athletes; and

"Whereas, along with these increased revenues and increased opportunities, there will be an increase in the pressures placed on



member institutions, and, in turn, their student-athletes, to perform athletically at the expense of time spent in other educational pursuits; and

"Whereas, the increased pressures of intercollegiate athletics are likely to prevent a large number of athletes, men and women, in the so-called 'revenue-producing sports' and 'nonrevenue-producing sports' from completing their coursework for a degree within the period of time covered by their athletic grants-in-aid;

"Now, Therefore, *Be It Resolved*, that the NCAA commit itself to the development of an Academic Trust Fund for scholarship athletes, men and women, in all sports, the purpose of which will be to provide the resources necessary for those athletes who are injured, or who exhaust their athletic eligibility without obtaining a degree, to remain in or return to school and complete their degree;

"*Be It Further Resolved*, that this Academic Trust Fund be financed by a percentage of the cable and television revenues available to the NCAA to be set aside in an Academic Trust Fund to be administered by trustees elected by the NCAA and by student-athletes;

"*Be It Finally Resolved*, that the NCAA Council commit itself to working with all interested parties on the development of an Academic Trust Fund such that appropriate amendments and/or bylaws necessary for the establishment of the Academic Trust Fund be readied for the 1983 NCAA Convention."

**Source:** South Carolina State College.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

## Appendix B

### 76th Annual Convention

#### Nominating Committee

Chair—John R. Davis

District 1—Harold S. Westerman, University of Maine, Orono  
 District 2—Olav B. Kollevoll, Lafayette College  
 District 3—Alberta Gatling, North Carolina Central University  
 District 4—Richard G. Shrider, Miami University (Ohio)  
 District 5—G. Jean Cerra, University of Missouri, Columbia  
 District 6—Charles H. Samson, Texas A&M University  
 District 7—Joseph L. Kearney, Western Athletic Conference  
 District 8—John R. Davis, Oregon State University  
 At Large—Doris Chambers, Kent State University  
 At Large—Robert C. Deming, Ithaca College  
 At Large—Mary Jean Mulvaney, University of Chicago  
 At Large—Casimir J. Myslinski, University of Pittsburgh  
 At Large—Sondra Norrell-Thomas, Howard University  
 At Large—Douglas R. Sanderson, California State Col., Stanislaus  
 At Large—Herman L. Sledzik, Indiana University of Pennsylvania  
 At Large—Helen Smiley, University of North Dakota

#### Men's Committee on Committees

Chair—Fred Jacoby

District 1—John B. Simpson, Boston University  
 District 2—Thomas J. Niland Jr., Le Moyne College  
 District 3—Kenneth G. Germann, Southern Conference  
 District 4—Dean Davenport, Ferris State College  
 District 5—Joe Lindahl, University of Northern Colorado  
 District 6—James A. Castaneda, Rice University  
 District 7—Glen C. Tuckett, Brigham Young University  
 District 8—Ferdinand A. Geiger, Stanford University  
 At Large—Eugene M. Haas, Gettysburg College  
 At Large—David A. Jacobs, Whitier College  
 At Large—Fred Jacoby, Mid-American Athletic Conference  
 At Large—Thomas M. Kinder, Bridgewater College (Virginia)

#### Women's Committee on Committees

Chair—Emma J. Best

District 1—Mary R. Barrett, Boston State College  
 District 2—Emma J. Best, University of District of Columbia  
 District 3—Nancy J. Olson, Florida International University  
 District 4—Phyllis Bailey, Ohio State University  
 District 5—Lynn Dorn, North Dakota State University  
 District 6—Dolores Copeland, University of Houston  
 District 7—Barbara Hollman, University of Montana  
 District 8—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego  
 At Large—Gail Bigglestone, University of New Hampshire

At Large—Patricia A. Thompson, Elmira College  
 At Large—Sylvia Moore, Oregon State University  
 At Large—Gloria Ray, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

### **Voting Committee**

Chair—Frank Windeger

District 1—Mary R. Barrett, Boston State College  
 District 2—Sandra Norrell-Thomas, Howard University  
 District 3—JoAnn Williams, St. Andrews Presbyterian College  
 District 4—Bruce A. Grimes, University of Wisconsin, Green Bay  
 District 5—Ron Koperski, Bradley University  
 District 6—Walter Reed, Jackson State University  
 District 7—Edward L. Hanson, Montana State University  
 District 8—Rudy Carvajal, California State Univ., Bakersfield  
 At Large—Billy M. Miller, Southwest Texas State University  
 At Large—Frank Windeger, Texas Christian University

### **Memorial Resolutions Committee**

Chair—Rev. Joseph Eagan

Mary Ellen Cloninger, University of Wyoming  
 Rev. Joseph Eagan, University of San Francisco  
 Kenneth L. Gardner, Northeast Missouri State University  
 Gary N. Wodder, University of Scranton

### **Credentials Committee**

Chair—Richard A. Clower

Richard A. Clower, Western Maryland College  
 C. Donald Cook, Fairfield University  
 Judith Hirsch, California State University, Hayward

### **Parliamentarian**

Alan J. Chapman, Rice University

### **Chair of Business Sessions**

James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)

### **Chair of General Round Table**

John L. Toner, University of Connecticut

### **1983 Convention**

Town and Country Hotel, San Diego, California, January 10-12

## **Appendix C**

### **NCAA Convention Sites, 1944-1982**

(Hotels in parentheses.)

38th	1944	New York City (Biltmore)
39th	1945	Columbus, Ohio (Deshler-Wallick)
40th	1946	St. Louis (Jefferson)
41st	1947	New York City (New Yorker)
42nd	1948	New York City (New Yorker)
43rd	1949	San Francisco (Saint Francis)
44th	1950	New York City (Commodore)
45th	1951	Dallas (Adolphus)
46th	1952	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
47th	1953	Washington (Mayflower)
48th	1954	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
49th	1955	New York City (New Yorker)
50th	1956	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
51st	1957	St. Louis (Jefferson)
52nd	1958	Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford)
53rd	1959	Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton)
54th	1960	New York City (Astor)
55th	1961	Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton)
56th	1962	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
57th	1963	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
58th	1964	New York City (Commodore)
59th	1965	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
60th	1966	Washington (Sheraton Park)
61st	1967	Houston (Sheraton Lincoln)
62nd	1968	New York City (Biltmore)
63rd	1969	Los Angeles (Hilton)
64th	1970	Washington (Statler Hilton)
65th	1971	Houston (Astroworld)
66th	1972	Hollywood, Florida (Diplomat)
67th	1973	Chicago (Palmer House)
1st Special	1973	Chicago (Regency Hyatt House)
68th	1974	San Francisco (St. Francis)
69th	1975	Washington (Sheraton-Park)
2nd Special	1975	Chicago (Palmer House)
3rd Special	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
70th	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
71st	1977	Miami Beach (Fontainebleau)
72nd	1978	Atlanta (Peachtree Plaza)
73rd	1979	San Francisco (St. Francis)
74th	1980	New Orleans (Fairmont)
75th	1981	Miami Beach (Fontainebleau Hilton)
76th	1982	Houston, Texas (Hyatt Regency)

NOTE: Prior to 1944, the annual Convention was held in December. No meeting was held in 1943, and commencing with 1944 the Convention has been held in January. The 1st and 2nd special Conventions were held in August. The 3rd special Convention was held immediately prior to the 70th Convention in January.

## Appendix D

### Past and Present Officers of the NCAA

#### President

1906-1913 Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy  
 1914-1916 LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University  
 1917-1929 Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy  
 1930-1932 Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University  
 1933-1937 Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference  
 1938-1940 William B. Owens, Stanford University  
 1941-1944 Phillip O. Badger, New York University  
 1945-1946 Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University, University of Wyoming  
 1947-1949 Karl E. Leib, University of Iowa  
 1950-1952 Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California  
 1953-1954 Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama  
 1955-1956 Clarence P. Houston, Tufts College  
 1957-1958 Frank N. Gardner, Drake University  
 1959-1960 Herbert J. Dorricott, Western State College (Colorado)  
 1961-1962 Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University  
 1963-1964 Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa  
 1965-1966 Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University  
 1967-1968 Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan  
 1969-1970 Harry M. Cross, University of Washington  
 1971-1972 Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee  
 1973-1974 Alan J. Chapman, Rice University  
 1975-1976 John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University  
 1977-1978 J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas, Austin  
 1979-1980 William J. Flynn, Boston College  
 1981- James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)

#### Secretary-Treasurer

\*1906-1908 Louis A. Bevier, Jr., Rutgers University  
 \*1908 William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia  
 1909-1939 Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University  
 1940-1944 Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference  
 1945-1951 Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference  
 1952-1954 Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska  
 1955-1956 Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan  
 1957-1958 Edwin D. Mouzon, Jr., Southern Methodist University  
 1959-1960 Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University  
 1961-1962 Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University  
 1963-1964 Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University  
 1965-1966 Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines  
 1967-1968 Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University  
 1969-1970 William J. Flynn, Boston College

\*Bevier served as secretary, Lambeth as treasurer, in 1908.

1971-1972 Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University, District of Columbia Teachers College

1973-1974 Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University  
 1975-1976 Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University  
 1977-1978 Edgar A. Sherman, Muskingum College  
 1979-1980 James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)  
 1981- John L. Toner, University of Connecticut

35	06
----	----

CALENDAR





NCAA

1NCAA00011236Q